UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

IN RE: COLUMBIA COLLEGE RANKINGS
ACTION

Case No. 1:22-cv-05945-PGG

(Consolidated with Case
No. 1:22-cv-06567-PGG)

**JURY DEMANDED**

## CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs Ravi Campbell, Student A, Student B, Student C and Student D (collectively, the "Plaintiffs"), by and through undersigned counsel, bring this action against The Board of Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York ("Defendant" or the "University" or "Columbia") on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, and make the following allegations based upon information, attorney investigation and belief, and upon Plaintiffs' own knowledge:

## NATURE OF ACTION

1.      Plaintiffs bring this action individually, and on behalf of all similarly situated persons, who enrolled as students at Columbia between 2011 and the present.

2.      Plaintiffs allege a violation of New York General Business Law ("GBL") Sections 349 and 350, breach of contract and unjust enrichment.

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3.      Subject matter jurisdiction exists under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) in that numerous adverse parties are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds $75,000.

4.      This Court also has subject matter jurisdiction under the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 ("CAFA").  Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that there are

thousands of class members who have been harmed by Defendant's conduct and that the amount in controversy exceeds $5,000,000.00.

5.      This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it does business in the State of New York and this District and a substantial portion of the wrongful conduct alleged herein took place in New York.  Defendant has also pursued this New York market and its customers through advertisements resulting in sales of its products in New York and this District.

6.      Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this District.

## PARTIES

7.      Plaintiff Ravi Campbell ("Campbell") is an individual and a resident and citizen of the State of New York.

8.      Plaintiff Student A is an individual and a resident and citizen of the State of New York.

9.      Plaintiff Student B is an individual and a resident and citizen of the State of New York.

10.      Plaintiff Student C is an individual and a resident and citizen of the State of Connecticut.

11.      Plaintiff Student D is an individual and a resident and citizen of the State of California.

12.      Plaintiff Campbell was enrolled as a student at Columbia from 2014 through 2018.

13.      Plaintiff Student A was enrolled as a graduate student at Columbia from 2019 through 2021.

14.     Plaintiff Student B was enrolled as a student at Columbia from 2014 through 2020.

15.     Plaintiff Student C was enrolled as a graduate student at Columbia from 2016 through 2020.

16.     Student D was enrolled as a graduate student at Columbia from 2011 through 2015.

17.     Defendant is the governing body vested with management and control of Columbia.

## STATEMENT OF FACTS

18.     Columbia is a private research university located in New York.

19.     Columbia has approximately 30,000 undergraduate, graduate, and professional students in any one school year.

20.     Universities in the United States compete for students.

21.     Various entities and organizations compile data on universities and assign the universities rankings as to their quality.

22.     Consumers of university offerings use these rankings in making their application and admission decisions.

23.     The Common Data Set Initiative ("CDS") was created in 2002 by the College Board, Peterson's and U.S. News & World Report ("USNWR") to standardize and improve college data transparency

24.     The CDS is "a collaborative effort among data providers in the higher education community. The goal of this collaboration is to improve the quality and accuracy of information provided to all involved in a student's transition into higher education."

25.     Columbia refused to participate in the CDS from its inception in 2002 to 2022.

26.     USNWR is an American media company that publishes news, consumer advice, analysis, and university rankings.

27.     USNWR's "Best National Universities" rankings ("USNWR's rankings") influence university application patterns.[1]

28.     USNWR's rankings rank institutions that offer a wide range of undergraduate majors as well as master's and doctoral degrees.[2]

29.     USNWR's rankings are calculated using seventeen (17) "measures of quality," including, but not limited to: class size, percent of faculty with a terminal degree in their field, percentage of faculty that is full-time, student-faculty ratio, financial resources per student, and graduation and retention rates. Normalized scores for each measure are weighted and added together, according to a formula, to arrive at a final overall score.[3]

30.     In 2021-2022, Columbia represented to USNWR that its student/faculty ratio was 6/1 and that 83% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students. *See* Exhibit A – Year 2021-2022.

31.     Columbia intentionally submitted annual data sets of its university characteristics

---

[1]     Michael Luca & Jonathan Smith, *Salience in Quality Disclosure: Evidence from the U.S. News College Rankings*, 22 J. Econ. & Mgmt. Strategy 58 (2013) (demonstrating that a one-rank improvement in USNWR rankings leads to a 1% increase in number of applicants).

[2]     *Best National University Rankings*, U.S. News & World Report (2022), https://www.usnews.com/best-colleges/rankings/national-universities ("Schools in the National Universities category, such as the University of Texas at Austin and the University of Vermont, offer a full range of undergraduate majors, plus master's and doctoral programs.") (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

[3]     Robert Morse & Eric Brooks, *A More Detailed Look at the Ranking Factors*, U.S. News & World Report (Sept. 12, 2021), https://www.usnews.com/education/bestcolleges/articles/ranking-criteriaandweights. (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

that it alone prepared.

32.     In order to prepare its annual data sets submitted to USNWR, a multitude of Columbia personnel and departments were involved in gathering the data to be self-reported to USNWR.

33.     These departments and personnel included, among others, the Office of Central Administration, the Office of the Provost, the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, the Vice President of Financial Affairs, the Office of the Registrar, the Office of Student Affairs, the Office of Financial Aid, and the Deans of the various Colleges at Columbia.

34.     Upon information and belief, Columbia formed a working group of personnel from all these many departments to gather the data to be submitted on an annual basis to USNWR.

35.     The individuals involved, or personnel under their control, included, upon information and belief:

(a)     Mary C. Boyce, Provost of Columbia;

(b)     Katrina A. Armstrong, Chief Executive Officer, Columbia University Irving Medical Center; Executive Vice President for Health and Biomedical Sciences, Columbia; Dean of the Faculties of Health Sciences and the Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons;

(c)     Jane Booth, Office of the General Counsel, representing Columbia in regulatory matters;

(d)     David Greenberg, Executive Vice President for Columbia's Facilities and Operations;

(e)     Amy Hungerford, Executive Vice President of Arts and Sciences and Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences;

(f)     Dennis A. Mitchell, DDS, MPH, Executive Vice President for Columbia's Life and Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement at Columbia University;

(g)     Shailagh Murray, Executive Vice President for Public Affairs, overseeing the Office of Communications and Public Affairs and the Office of Government and Community Affairs;

(h)     Gerald Rosberg, Senior Executive Vice President of Columbia, interfacing with the President and Columbia University's senior leadership on long-term planning and human resource and other strategic issues, with a particular focus on coordination across departments;

(i)     Anne Sullivan, Executive Vice President for Finance and Information Technology, overseeing Columbia's operating and capital budget, the Controller's Office operations, Student Financial Services, the Office of the University Registrar, Treasury operations, procurement and internal audit activities at the University, and Columbia University Information Technology;

(j)     Joan C. Waters, Ombud's Officer, responsible for offering independent, impartial, and confidential services for the entire Columbia community of students, faculty, and staff on all campuses; and

(k)     Susan Glancy, Chief of Staff of the Office of the President, responsible for providing administrative and strategic support to President

Bollinger and his senior staff for Columbia initiatives as well as day-to-

day operations.

36.     Upon information and belief, the working group funneled their data to an

executive group, which was responsible for submitting the data to USNWR in written form on an

annual basis.

37.     Columbia has a copy of each annual data set submitted to USNWR, all of which

are under its supervision and control.

38.     USNWR relied on universities, including Columbia, to self-report the data used to

determine the universities' rankings.

39.     Prospective students, including Plaintiffs and members of the Class (defined

below), rely on USNWR's rankings (and the truthfulness of the information implicitly contained

within them, *i.e.*, class sizes, faculty resources, student-faculty ratios, graduation and retention

rates, and financial resources, etc.) when deciding whether to apply to and/or attend a university.

40.     Universities, including Columbia, intentionally use USNWR's rankings as

marketing tools to recruit students.[4]

41.     Columbia intentionally submitted its own data sets to USNWR from 1988 to 2022

in order to obtain a ranking of quality from USNWR.

42.     Columbia was in turn ranked as to its quality as a university by USNWR from

1988 to 2022.

43.     Columbia's USNWR ranking has steadily risen from 18th place in 1988 to 2nd

---

[4]     *See, e.g.,* Columbia University, *Columbia Video Network: Fully Online Graduate Engineering Degrees*,  https://www.cvn.columbia.edu/ (Last visited November 2, 2022) ("Ranked #1 online graduate engineering program by US News, Columbia Video Network offers certificates and degrees in the fields of computer science, biomedical, mechanical engineering, and more.")

place in 2022 as Columbia each year submitted a new data set to USNWR, which it represented

set forth truthfully and accurately its internal university statistics.

44.    On or about February 28, 2022, Michael Thaddeus, Professor of Mathematics at

Columbia, published an expose demonstrating that Columbia misreported data to USNWR that

was used to calculate Columbia's USNWR rankings.[5]

45.    Professor Thaddeus made numerous findings, including, but not limited to, the

following:

(a)    Columbia reported to USNWR that 82.5% of undergraduate classes enroll

fewer than twenty (20) students – a higher percentage than any other school in the top

100 USNWR rankings.  Data from Columbia's Directory of Classes indicated that the

correct figure is likely between 62.7% and 66.9%.  ***In fact, after Professor Thaddeus***

***published his expose, Columbia <u>admitted</u> that only 57% of its classes had fewer than***

***twenty (20) students***.

(b)    Columbia reported to USNWR that 8.9% of undergraduate classes enroll

fifty (50) students or more.  Data from Columbia's Directory of Classes indicated that the

correct figure is likely between 10.6% and 12.4%;

(c)    Columbia reported to USNWR that 100% of its full-time faculty hold a

terminal degree (*i.e.*, PhD, MBA, MFA, etc.).  Data from Columbia's College Bulletin

indicated that the correct figure is at most 96% and probably lower.  ***In fact, after***

***Professor Thaddeus published his expose, Columbia <u>admitted</u> that only 95% of its***

---

[5]    Michael Thaddeus, *An Investigation of the Facts Behind Columbia's U.S. News Ranking* (Feb. 28, 2022), https://www.math.columbia.edu/~thaddeus/ranking/executivesummary.pdf.    (Last    visited November 2, 2022).

*faculty held terminal degrees in 2022*;

(d)     Columbia reported to USNWR that 96.5% of its non-medical faculty are full-time.  Data submitted to the United States Department of Education indicated that the correct figure is likely 74.1%; and

(e)     Columbia reported to USNWR that it spent some undisclosed amount of money on instruction.  However, Columbia reported to the United States Department of Education that it spends $3.1 billion on instruction.  Data from Columbia's financial statements shows that much of this $3.1 billion represents expenditures on patient care made by Columbia's medical center, and, therefore, that the correct figure is much lower.

46.     On or about June 30, 2022, in response to Professor Thaddeus' article, Columbia announced that it would not participate in the next USNWR rankings.[6]

47.     Further on June 30, 2022, Columbia's Office of Provost issued a statement entitled "Provost Mary Boyce's Statement Regarding U.S. News and World Report's Undergraduate Survey."  The statement stated:

> Announcement regarding the University's decision to refrain from submitting data to U.S. News and World Report for this year's undergraduate college rankings.
>
> June 30, 2022
>
> A few months ago, a member of our faculty, Professor Michael Thaddeus, raised questions regarding the accuracy of some of the data the University submitted to U.S. News and World Report for its annual ranking of undergraduate universities. Columbia leaders take these questions seriously, and we immediately embarked on a review of our data collection and submissions process.

---

[6]     Anemona Hartocollis, *Columbia Won't Participate in the Next U.S. News Rankings*, N.Y. Times (June 30, 2022), https://www.nytimes.com/2022/06/30/us/columbia-us-news-rankings.html. (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

In light of the work underway, we will refrain from submitting to U.S. News and World Report this year. The deadline for that submission is July 1. Given the extensive analysis required to review the data and ensure it complies with U.S. News methodologies, we cannot complete our work with the appropriate care within that timeframe.

Columbia has long conducted what we believed to be a thorough process for gathering and reporting institutional data, but we are now closely reviewing our processes in light of the questions raised. The ongoing review is a matter of integrity. We will take no shortcuts in getting it right.

To help support prospective students and their families as they consider college choices, we plan to publish a Common Data Set this fall that will provide a useful profile of the extraordinary undergraduate experience at Columbia, including much of the same information that the U.S. News university profiles impart.

While disappointed that we will not be able to submit this year, a thorough review cannot be rushed. We pledge that we will work quickly and decisively to complete our process and move forward. [7]

48.     On or about July 7, 2022, USNWR announced that it had "unranked" Columbia after being unable to verify the data Columbia previously submitted to USNWR.[8, 9]

49.     On September 9, 2022, Columbia's Office of Provost issued a statement entitled "Provost Mary Boyce's Announces Release of Two Common Data Sets."  The statement stated in relevant part:

The University announced in June that Columbia would begin, starting this fall, to participate in the Common Data Set initiative, an effort by colleges and

---

[7]     *Provost Mary Boyce's Statement Regarding U.S. News and World Report's Undergraduate Survey.* Office of the Provost. (June 30, 2022) https://provost.columbia.edu/news/provost-mary-boyce-statement-regarding-us-news undergraduate-survey (Last visited on November 3, 2022).

[8]     Robert Morse & Eric Brooks, *U.S. News Unranks Columbia University in 2022 Best Colleges Rankings*, U.S. News & World Report, (July 7, 2022), https://www.usnews.com/education/blogs/collegerankings-blog/articles/2022-07-07/u-s-news-unrankscolumbia-university-in-2022-best-colleges-rankings.  (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

[9]     Anemona Hartocollis, *Columbia Loses Its No. 2 Spot in the U.S. News Rankings*, N.Y. Times, (July 8, 2022), https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/08/us/us-news-rankings-columbia.html.  (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

universities to provide a useful array of data to prospective undergraduates to assist in their college admissions journey.  Today we are posting two Common Data Sets, one for Columbia College and Columbia Engineering, and one for Columbia General Studies. A new web page also has been launched to provide additional detail, context, and analysis of the undergraduate experience here at Columbia University.

The information included in the two Common Data Sets reflects the University's work in recent months to review our data collection processes, following questions raised by a faculty member regarding the accuracy of certain data the University submitted to U.S. News and World Report in 2021 for its ranking of undergraduate universities.

As a result of those questions, the University committed to conducting a thorough assessment of its processes and to making changes wherever warranted.  The review proved to be extensive and time consuming, requiring the University to announce in June that we would not submit data to U.S. News for this year's undergraduate rankings.

Both the Common Data Set and U.S. News require submissions that include more than 100 specific requests and cover thousands of data points.  Our review covered all information represented in this year's Common Data Sets.  *On two of the metrics questioned by our faculty member, class size and faculty with terminal degrees, we determined we had previously relied on outdated and/or incorrect methodologies*. We have changed those methodologies for current and future data submissions, as reflected in the newly posted Common Data Sets.

Class Size. In some cases, class size data was previously reported incorrectly and not in compliance with the U.S. News instructions. While many of Columbia's undergraduate classes have long had under 20 students, *the prior methodologies used resulted in overreporting the number of classes with under 20 students and underreporting of classes with between 20 and 29 students*.

The data in our newly posted Common Data Sets strictly adhere to Common Data Set instructions as we understand them and reflect the correct number of classes in each of the prescribed categories for the fall 2021 semester. Columbia's undergraduate programs are designed around a pedagogical commitment to highly interactive engagement among undergraduate students and faculty.  *As shown in the Common Data Sets, 57% of undergraduate classes had enrollments of under 20 students in fall 2021*, 74% under 25 students, and 77% under 30. Our web page provides additional information about the type and size of undergraduate classes at Columbia.

Faculty with Terminal Degrees. With respect to the number of our full-time faculty who have terminal degrees (which is not always a PhD), our previous methodology relied on the University's requirements for appointments to a

11

specific faculty rank in a school or discipline. While the vast majority of our faculty have always had terminal degrees, the Common Data Set definitions of terminal degrees in certain disciplines are different from Columbia's requirements, resulting in some overreporting. *We have revised our methodologies to strictly conform to the Common Data Set definitions which show that 95.4% of our full-time faculty have terminal degrees*. Details and additional information about our faculty are included on our Common Data Set submissions and accompanying web page.

The Columbia undergraduate experience is and always has been centered around small classes taught by highly accomplished faculty. That fact is unchanged. But anything less than complete accuracy in the data that we report – regardless of the size or the reason – is inconsistent with the standards of excellence to which Columbia holds itself. *We deeply regret the deficiencies in our prior reporting and are committed to doing better*. [10] [Emphasis added].

50.      On September 9, 2022, The Washington Post issued an article entitled *Columbia acknowledges giving incorrect data for U.S. News rankings*. The article stated:

*Columbia University disclosed Friday that it had reported faulty data on class size and faculty credentials to a publication that produces widely known college rankings — errors that it attributed to a reliance on "outdated and/or incorrect methodologies*."

With the acknowledgment of the embarrassing missteps, the Ivy League university in New York expressed contrition over problems that appeared to have been first identified by a whistleblowing math professor skeptical of how Columbia had come to be ranked second in the nation by U.S. News & World Report.

Ultimately, the university lost that ranking as it sought to answer questions the professor raised about data on class size, faculty and other matters that Columbia sent to U.S. News. Friday's statement capped an internal review of the matter.

"*We deeply regret the deficiencies in our prior reporting and are committed to doing better*," Columbia's provost, Mary Boyce, said in the statement.

*The statement provided some detail about the errors, but did not clarify exactly what went wrong*.   Columbia said it had overreported the number of undergraduate classes with less than 20 students and the share of full-time faculty with terminal degrees such as a PhD. *But the university did not specify how*

---

[10]      *Provost Mary Boyce Announces Release of Two Common Data Sets.* Office of the Provost. (Sept. 9, 2022) https://provost.columbia.edu/statement-common-data-set (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

*much it overreported those figures*.

*U.S. News published last year a chart showing 83 percent of Columbia's classes in fall 2020 had fewer than 20 students.* It was the highest such share reported that year among the top 50 universities.

That is the kind of statistic likely to lure college-bound students and parents. It also was likely far off the mark.

*Columbia confirmed Friday that the share of undergraduate classes in fall 2021 with under 20 students was 57 percent.* The university also confirmed that the share of full-time faculty with terminal degrees was 95.4 percent.

The faculty whistleblower, Michael Thaddeus, has written that Columbia previously claimed the share with terminal degrees was 100 percent.

Also Friday, Columbia posted online for the first time statistical profiles related to its undergraduate programs in the format known as the Common Data Set. Until now, it had been the only Ivy League school that declined to take that step toward transparency.

Thaddeus said he was flabbergasted to see the data and was reviewing the information. He questioned other figures Columbia has provided over the years about class sizes.

"*It's hard to believe that this was an inadvertent error or a minor matter of methodology*," Thaddeus said. "*More likely, someone in the University knew that there was serious misrepresentation afoot. If so, who was it*?"

In July, after acknowledging questions about its data reporting, Columbia was removed from the No. 2 spot on the U.S. News national university list and placed in the peculiar position of being unranked. Earlier, the university said it would not submit data for the 2023 edition of the rankings, which will be announced Monday.

Columbia had been a fixture in the U.S. News top 10. The last time it fell outside that exclusive club occurred in fall 2003, according to U.S. News chief data strategist Robert Morse, when it was listed 11th among national universities for the 2004 edition of the rankings.

It rose in recent years, from No. 4 in fall 2010 to No. 3 in fall 2018 and No. 2 last fall, tied with Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in the 2022 published edition of the U.S. News rankings.

Columbia's ascent on the prestige list drew skepticism from Thaddeus, a professor of mathematics, who published in February, with an update in March, a

13

blistering critique of the university's data reporting and the rankings themselves.

Thaddeus, curious about the numbers behind Columbia's position, dove into the U.S. News ranking methodology and what he could glean from publicly available sources on the university's faculty, enrollment, class sizes and finances.  He found what he believed were troubling discrepancies between what the university was claiming on certain key measures and what might actually be the case.

The critique touched off the internal scrutiny at Columbia.

"The role played by Columbia itself in this drama is troubling and strange," Thaddeus wrote in his critique. "In some ways its conduct seems typical of an elite institution with a strong interest in crafting a positive image from the data that it collects."

Columbia is far from the only prominent college or university to make an embarrassing revelation of faulty data sent to U.S. News and others. Claremont McKenna College acknowledged in 2012 that it had misreported various admissions statistics. Emory University disclosed similar problems that year, and so did George Washington University. From time to time, other schools have acknowledged troubles with data used to rank undergraduate and graduate programs.  [Emphasis added].

51.     On September 10, 2022, the Columbia Spectator issued an article entitled *In U.S.*

*News scandal, a confession, an apology, and previously unreleased data emerge*.  The article

stated:

After months of criticism and confusion, University Provost Mary Boyce admitted Friday evening that the University misreported data to U.S. News & World Report in its submission to the publication's 2021 Best Colleges ranking, confirming allegations first leveled by mathematics professor Michael Thaddeus in February.

Boyce also publicly released, for the first time, the University's Common Data Set, a trove of statistical information that is used to inform school rankings.  Until now, Columbia was the only Ivy League university to not publicly release such data and also appears to be the only Ivy to become embroiled in a misreporting scandal, although many other colleges and universities have misreported to U.S. News in the past.

Columbia's ranking in the 2021 list boosted the University to an unprecedented level of prestige – a three-way tie as the second-best school in the country alongside Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and behind only Princeton University.  The No. 2 ranking was frequently touted by

the University.

It is clear now, officially, that Columbia's No. 2 ranking was based in part on information that was factually incorrect.

In an announcement to the University community, Boyce wrote that her office "had previously relied on outdated and/or incorrect methodologies" when collecting and submitting data about average class sizes and the amount of faculty with terminal degrees, which are often, but not always, doctorates. It's still unclear what those methodologies were and who exactly is directly responsible for the mistakes.

The validity of the data was first questioned in a high-profile way last spring, when Thaddeus published an analysis on a Columbia-hosted site that alleged inconsistencies in the University's representation of information about its undergraduate course sizes, student-to-faculty ratio, and graduation outcomes, among other data.

Boyce acknowledged that class size data was previously reported incorrectly and "not in compliance with the U.S. News instructions." The "prior methodologies," she said, "caused the University to overreport the number of classes with under 20 students and underreport classes with between 20 and 29 students."

The Common Data Set now shows that in fall 2021, 57 percent of undergraduate classes had enrollments of under 20 students, and about three quarters of classes had enrollments of under 25. In his analysis, Thaddeus said that the University had previously reported that 82.5 percent of its undergraduate classes had under 20 students.

"Provost Boyce, by attributing the discrepancy to 'outdated and/or incorrect methodologies,' does serious damage to her own credibility," Thaddeus said in a statement to Spectator on Friday.

The Common Data Set also now puts the number of full-time faculty with "terminal degrees," which are usually doctorates, at 95 percent. Thaddeus said the University previously reported 100 percent.

"We deeply regret the deficiencies in our prior reporting and are committed to doing better," Boyce said in the Friday announcement. She added that the University will "continue to refine and review" its methodologies and that a third-party advisory firm, the Ankura Consulting Group, reviewed the new Common Data Set.

Class sizes and faculty education levels are two factors of campus life that have long been at the center of conversations about the quality of education that Columbia offers its undergraduates.

The University promises students close access to "highly accomplished faculty" through "small discussion-based classes," particularly through the Core Curriculum. It's a pledge that has come under scrutiny in recent years as the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, which is responsible for fulfilling the promise of the Core Curriculum, has come up against budgetary challenges and space constraints.

These criticisms came to a head last year amid classroom shortages and overenrolled courses, when about 9 percent more undergraduate students were enrolled in 2021 than the year prior due to administrators' uncertainty about how the pandemic would affect admitted student yield, and because of deferrals and leaves of absence. At the same time, administrators were considering enrolling even more students, an effort that was eventually postponed, for the most part, after faculty raised concerns.

In the months following Thaddeus' allegations, Boyce said her office conducted an "extensive and time consuming" assessment of its collection and submission practices. That review was conducted largely behind closed doors, and some faculty believe that University administrators have not been transparent enough about what had gone wrong, eight current faculty members confirmed to Spectator.

Those faculty members called the University's misreporting on the whole concerning. Over half of them also said they felt the scandal, which has now dragged on for months amid intense administrative turnover and a search for the next University president, has damaged the University's reputation.

52.     On September 12, 2022, The Chronicle issued an article entitled *Columbia*

*University Acknowledges Submission of Inaccurate Data for Consideration in College Rankings*.

The article stated:

"The undergraduate experience at Columbia has always focused on small classes taught by highly qualified faculty. This fact is unchanged. But anything other than complete accuracy of the data we report — regardless of size or reason — is inconsistent with the standards of excellence Columbia adheres to," the statement said. "We deeply regret the deficiencies in our previous reporting and strive to do better."

In February, Columbia University math professor Michael Thaddeus questioned the Ivy League school's rise from 18th place when it debuted in 1988 to 2$^{nd}$ place in 2021.

In a statement released on Columbia University's Department of Mathematics

website, Thaddeus noted that "few other top-flight universities have risen in position, but none have matched Columbia's extraordinary rise."

Thaddeus cited data provided by the university to *US News & World Report* to question Colombia's seemingly meteoric rise in the rankings.

"Can we be sure that the data reflects the reality within the university?" Thaddeus asked rhetorically. "Unfortunately, the answer is no."

The math professor then tabulated data on "student size, percentage of faculty graduating, percentage of full-time faculty, and student-to-faculty ratio" submitted by Columbia University to *US News & World Report* and compared the data "to figures otherwise calculated and based on information published elsewhere by Columbia.

In his findings, Thaddeus said there were "sometimes pretty big discrepancies" that always seemed to work in Colombia's favour.

In response to Thaddeus' findings, Columbia University Provost Mary Boyce said in a June statement that the university "will refrain from submitting data to *US News and World Report*" in order to rank it among undergraduate colleges 2022 of publication to be considered.

"On two of the metrics questioned by our faculty member [Thaddeus], class size, and faculty graduating, we found that we had previously relied on outdated and/or incorrect methods. We have modified these methods for current and future data submissions, as reflected in the newly released Common Data Sets," Boyce noted in June.

Boyce said the university will participate in the Common Data Set (CDS) initiative, "a collaborative effort by data providers in the college community and publishers," beginning in the fall of 2022, to provide accurate information to students seeking information about colleges. according to the initiative's website.

The CDS initiative, represented by *US News & World Report*, the College Board and education services company Peterson's, was created in 1997 to provide colleges with "a set of standards and definitions of data items, rather than a survey tool or set of data that be represented in a database."

In conjunction with the commitment to participate in the CDS initiative, Boyce also announced the launch of a new website that will provide detailed context and analysis of the Columbia University student experience, "The 2022 Edition of Best Colleges (first published September 2021)," in which it said that the university "has not responded to multiple requests from *US News* that the university substantiate certain previously submitted dates," according to a *US News* blog post.  It is unclear whether Thaddeus' publication of his examination

of the data provided by Columbia *US News & World Report* may have contributed to the university's failure to rank.

In Friday's statement, Boyce said the university released two joint datasets, one for Columbia College and Columbia Engineering and one for Columbia General Studies.

"The information contained in the two joint datasets reflects the University's work over the past few months to review our data collection processes after a faculty member asked questions about the accuracy of certain data the University provided to the *US News* and World Report in 2021 for it had submitted undergraduate university rankings," Boyce said.

CNN reached out to *US News & World Report* Sunday night to respond to Columbia's Friday statement, but a representative was not immediately available for comment.

Boyce added that the university will "continue to refine and review" its methods of reporting data, adding that "aspects of an education at Columbia cannot be measured by common denominators."

53.    On September 16, 2022, The Guardian issued an article entitled *Columbia whistleblower on exposing college rankings: "They are worthless" US News relegated Columbia to 18th from second place after it was revealed the college had misrepresented key statistics.* The article stated:

The Columbia University academic whose exposure of false data caused the prestigious institution to plunge in US college rankings has accused its administration of deception and a whitewash over the affair.

Michael Thaddeus, a mathematics professor, said that by submitting rigged numbers to drive the university up the influential *US News & World Report* rankings, Columbia put its financial priorities ahead of students education in order to fund a ballooning and secretive bureaucracy.

On Monday, *US News **relegated Columbia from second to 18th in the latest rankings after the college admitted to "outdated and/ or incorrect methodologies" in some of its previous claims about the quality of the education the university provides***.

"***I find it very difficult to believe the errors were honest and inadvertent at this point,*"** Thaddeus told the Guardian*.

18

He added: "The response that the university made was not the forthright, direct, complete response of a university that really wanted to clear the air and really wanted to inform the public.  They address certain issues but then they completely ignored or whitewashed other ones."

Thaddeus embarrassed Columbia and shocked the academic world in February when he published a lengthy analysis accusing the university of submitting "inaccurate, dubious or highly misleading" statistics for the *US News* rankings. Among other things, he took issue with claims about class sizes, which the mathematics professor said he knew from experience were not accurate, and the assertion that all of the university's faculty held the highest degrees in their fields.

Thaddeus also said the university hugely overstated spending on instruction, claiming it far exceeded other Ivy League universities, by adding in the cost of patient care in the medical school.

Columbia initially defended its numbers before admitting on Friday that Thaddeus was right about class sizes and the qualifications of its teaching staff. "We deeply regret the deficiencies in our prior reporting and are committed to doing better," Columbia's provost, Mary Boyce, said in the statement.

In July, the university said it was pulling out of this year's rankings. *US News* made its own calculations, based in part on federal data, and this week moved the university down a humiliating 16 places.

Thaddeus began digging into the numbers as Columbia celebrated its stunning rise in the rankings from 18th in 1988. It broke into the top five in 2011 and eventually made second place last year.

"A few other top-tier universities have also improved their standings, but none has matched Columbia's extraordinary rise. It is natural to wonder what the reason might be," he wrote in his analysis.

When Thaddeus began to suspect that Columbia's numbers didn't add up, he saw the opportunity to discredit a system he regards as a con perpetrated on prospective students desperate to ensure that the tens of thousands of dollars a year many will spend on gigantic tuition fees are worth it.

The *US News* rankings, alongside less influential ones by the *Wall Street Journal*, *Forbes* and other publications, have a significant impact on which universities prospective students favor.   Thaddeus said Columbia's fall exposes the shoddiness of a system that relies on an institution's own numbers without checking.

"I've long believed that all university rankings are essentially worthless. They're based on data that have very little to do with the academic merit of an institution

19

and that the data might not be accurate in the first place," he said.

"It was never my objective to knock Columbia down the rankings. A better outcome would be if the rankings themselves are knocked down and people just stop reading them, stop taking them as seriously as they have."

It's not the first scandal involving the *US News* rankings.  Last year, a former dean of Temple University's business school in Philadelphia was sent to prison for fraud after rigging data to move the college's MBA sharply up the rankings.

But Thaddeus, who has taught at Columbia for 24 years, also had another target in his sights -- his own university's administration.

The former head of Columbia's mathematics department described an expanding and self-replicating bureaucracy that is growing ever more expensive to maintain. He said that Columbia's endowment is not large enough to cover the cost of the growing administration and so it is paid for by increasing tuition costs.

"It means that our educational programmes have to be run to some degree as money-making ventures.  That is the secret that can't be openly acknowledged," he said. Thaddeus suspects administrators rigged the data to move the university up the rankings in order to justify rising tuition fees which, at about $65,000 a year, are more than five times the amount paid by the parents of today's students in the 1980s.

"It's clear that the growth of university bureaucracies and administration has been a major driver of the cost of higher education growing much, much faster than inflation. We now have about 4,500 administrators on the main campus, about three times the number of faculty, and that's a new development over the past 20 years," he said.

"What is less clear is what all these administrators are actually doing.  They say that more administrators are needed to comply with government regulations. There may be a little truth to that, but not much, because these regulations in question were enacted decades ago. There hasn't been a lot of new university regulation that I know of."

Thaddeus acknowledged that there was a need for more staff to provide services that were not previously available such as much more extensive career placement, counseling and psychiatric care.  But he does not believe that accounts for the growth of a bureaucracy he describes as self-serving and unaccountable.

"I was kind of radicalised by the experience of being department chair in mathematics from 2017 to 2020. That's when I saw how secretive, how autocratic, Columbia's administration is. How they never share relevant information with faculty or students or the public.  This episode has just seriously

damaged the credibility of the administration. That saddens me, but it's also important that these issues get out in the open," he said.

Thaddeus said that initially he was not willing to accuse the university of deliberately manipulating the rankings system.

"When I first wrote my article, I expressed greater agnosticism on this point," he said. But he said the university's response, including its failure to be transparent about how the false data came to be reported, caused him to believe Columbia deliberately gamed the system.

"Also, there's been no move by the university to commission an external investigation, an investigation at arm's length by a third party such as a law firm, which is standard practice when ranking scandals erupt.  If I had seen some move like that by the university, I would be more inclined to think that the errors were honest and inadvertent," he said.

Approached for comment, Columbia said it had nothing to add to the statements it has already made.  [Emphasis added].

54.     On September 22, 2022, <u>CNN</u> issued an article entitled *College rankings whistleblower: Exposing inaccurate data was unpleasant but necessary*.  The article stated:

(CNN) -- The scandal engulfing Columbia University and U.S. News & World Report rose to a new level last week, when Columbia acknowledged that some of the figures it had submitted last year to U.S. News were inaccurate.  *U.S. News initially removed Columbia from its ranking entirely, then demoted it from second to 18th place after Columbia declined to submit this year's ranking survey*.

The article that first exposed Columbia's misrepresentation was written not by a disgruntled rival but by a tenured professor in Columbia's own math department. Many people must have scratched their heads and wondered, "Why did he do it?"

I am the Columbia math professor in question, and I would be the first to admit that what I did was both unusual and unpleasant. I began looking into the matter because my suspicions were piqued by Columbia's dubious claim to U.S. News that 83% of its undergraduate classes enrolled under 20 students. I assumed that Columbia would address the questions I raised promptly and forthrightly. I never guessed that its response would be so slow and clumsy, causing the scandal to drag on for months. While the short-term damage to Columbia's reputation has been painful to witness, I'm convinced that it was necessary for me to speak out.

Columbia's leadership over the last two decades has made an unsustainable choice to portray life at the university in ways that are fundamentally at odds with

reality. The phony ranking data are merely symptoms of this deeper malaise.

The public was told for years, for example, that Columbia had a higher proportion of small undergraduate classes (those with fewer than 20 students) than any other leading university. Last week, the truth that Columbia faculty and students have long known was confirmed: our undergraduate class sizes are by no means remarkably small. In fact, ***Columbia's proportion of small classes is the second-worst in the Ivy League, not the best as Columbia had claimed.***

Likewise, ***our administration had claimed that the overwhelming majority of faculty on our main campus was full-time, but now we learn that this, too, was false.*** In reality, the numbers of part-time faculty and full-time faculty are almost the same. Columbia, like so many other universities, is embracing the "gig economy," outsourcing much of its instruction to temporary workers, who lack both adequate benefits and the protection of tenure that has enabled me to speak freely.

To be sure, Columbia is a wealthy institution with a multi-billion-dollar endowment, but its assets have too often been misspent. Funds have been squandered on misguided projects, like a string of "Global Centers" on four continents, which do not recruit students and do not hire faculty, only administrators.

Meanwhile, the core components of the university, including its undergraduate colleges, are starved for resources and space. There are more than 9 students on the meal plan for every seat in our packed dining halls, according to a report in the Columbia Daily Spectator last spring. Consequently, our students frequently can't sit down at meal times and have to eat standing up. That's unworthy of a top-ranked university; in fact, it's unworthy of any university at all.

Columbia often boasts of its financial commitment to students in Columbia College, who are admitted without regard to their ability to pay, and who are offered debt-free financial aid packages. It is less fond of discussing the terms offered to undergraduates in its School of General Studies, who, even though they tend to come from less wealthy families, receive far less generous financial aid and frequently incur severe debts.

In this context, Provost Mary Boyce's announcement earlier this month attributing the U.S. News reporting inaccuracies to "outdated and/or incorrect methodologies," rang hollow to many students and faculty. ***Something more than methodology is at fault when one of the key figures, reported to be 83%, actually turns out to be 57%.*** Many pressing questions remain unanswered: How long did the misrepresentations persist? Who was responsible for them? And did our top leadership, including Boyce and President Lee Bollinger, know what was afoot?

22

These questions can only be satisfactorily addressed by an independent review, conducted by an external body such as a law firm.  Columbia should commission one right away, without delays or excuses.  This has been standard practice in the all-too-common scandals involving the U.S. News rankings, including one at Claremont McKenna College in 2012 that led to the resignation of its dean of admissions, and another at Temple University in 2018 that led to the imprisonment of the business school dean for conspiracy and wire fraud.

U.S. News, too, has much to answer for in this scandal.  While it casts the college rankings as a consumer service, the product it peddles has done enormous harm to American higher education. Its conception of academic merit is simplistic and distorted. U.S. News claims to determine the "Best Colleges," but all it really does is add up a series of somewhat extraneous variables, such as alumni giving and administrative spending.

It makes no attempt to assess the quality of teaching and scholarship directly.  For how could it? A good education is a subtle thing that is far too complex to be reduced to a single number. The one-size-fits-all approach of the U.S. News ranking ignores the reality that different students have different interests and needs.  Some favor the arts, for example, while others prefer the sciences, but the ranking makes no such distinction. Students are ill advised to rely on an arbitrary rating assigned by others rather than choosing thoughtfully for themselves.

U.S. News says it relies on schools to report their data accurately.  But asking schools to report unaudited data about themselves exposes them to intense conflicts of interest.  Administrators are incentivized to manipulate figures, game the system, and focus on parameters of dubious importance while paying scant attention to what happens in the classroom.

At the most basic level, the U.S. News ranking is a failure because the purported facts on which it is based cannot be trusted. Plainly, its vetting of the data reported by colleges has been cursory, even shoddy.

*Fortunately, society is waking up to the chicanery of the rankings scam*. The US Secretary of Education, Miguel Cardona, called college rankings "a joke" in a speech last month. "Breaking Ranks," a new book by former Reed College President Colin Diver, sweeps away whatever shreds of credibility the rankings business retains. Meanwhile, websites like College Scorecard and College Navigator, created by the US Department of Education and the National Center for Education Statistics, are providing a meaningful alternative to rankings by supplying fine-grained data and permitting applicants to search based on their interests. There's hope that future students will see college rankings for what they are: a deception and a distraction.

The details of this scandal, like most scandals, are complicated and confusing. But its lessons are clear and simple. Columbia should conduct a thorough

housecleaning of its administrative leadership and renew its commitment to teaching and research. And U.S. News should get out of the rankings business altogether. [Emphasis added].

55.     On September 12, 2022, Columbia was downgraded from 2nd place to 18th place in the USNWR rankings.[11]

56.     When explicit rankings of colleges are published in USNWR, a one-rank improvement leads to a 1-percentage-point increase in the number of applicants to that college. Michael Luca & Jonathan Smith, *Salience in Quality Disclosure: Evidence from the U.S. News College Rankings,* 22 J. Econ & Mgmt. Strategy 58 (2013).

## COLUMBIA ADMITTED IT FALSELY MISREPRESENTED CRITICAL DATA TO USNWR FOR 2021-2022

57.     Columbia mispresented to USNWR critical data that determined its USNWR ranking for the 2021-2022 school year, including, but not limited to, data about class sizes, faculty resources, student-faculty ratios, graduation and retention rates, and financial resources.

58.     Columbia was ranked second (2nd) on USNWR's rankings in 2021-2022. *See* Exhibit A – Year 2021-2022.

59.     Columbia reported to USNWR that 83% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students in 2021-2022. *Id.*

60.     Columbia had the highest percentage of classes with fewer than twenty (20) students of any university on USNWR's rankings in 2021-2022. *Id.*

61.     After the publication of Professor Thaddeus's report and prior to Columbia's demotion from 2nd place to 18th place on USNWR's rankings, Columbia submitted revised data

---

[11]     James Barron, *Columbia Loses A-Plus Status in U.S. News Rankings,* N.Y. Times (Sept. 13, 2022) (https://www.nytimes.com/2022/09/13/nyregion/columbia-loses-a-plus-status-in-us-news-rankings.html?searchResultPosition=1) (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

to the Common Data Set Initiative now admitting that only 57% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students in 2021-2022.

62.     Columbia reported to USNWR that 100% of its faculty held terminal degrees in 2021-2022.

63.     After the publication of Professor Thaddeus's report and prior to Columbia's demotion from number 2 to number 18 on USNWR's rankings, Columbia submitted revised data to the Common Data Set Initiative now admitting that only 95% of its faculty held terminal degrees in 2021-2022.

### COLUMBIA ALSO FALSELY MISREPRESENTED CRITICAL DATA TO USNWR FROM 2011-2012 TO 2021-2022

**Overview**

64.     Upon information and belief, Columbia misrepresented to USNWR critical data that determined its USNWR ranking from 2011-2012 through 2021-2022.

65.     From 2011-2012 to 2021-2022, there existed an inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2011-2012 through 2021-2022.

66.     Where a university's student/faculty ratio increased between two (2) years, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally decreased between those years.  *Id.*  For example, between the 2011-2012 and 2016-2017 school years, Washington University in St. Louis's student/faculty ratio *increased* from 7/1 to 8/1 and its percentage of classes with fewer than twenty (20) students *decreased* from 70% to 63%.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2011-2012 through 2016-2017.  This comports with common sense, because when there are more students per faculty member, class sizes tend to grow and there tend to be fewer small classes.

67.     Where a university's student/faculty ratio decreased between two years, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally increased between those years.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2011-2012 through 2021-2022. For example, between the 2011-2012 and 2020-2021 school years, the University of Notre Dame's student/faculty ratio *decreased* from 12/1 to 9/1 and its percentage of classes with fewer than twenty (20) students *increased* from 55% to 62%.  *Id.*  This comports with common sense, because when there are fewer students per faculty member, class sizes tend to shrink and there tend to be more small classes.

68.     Where a university's student/faculty ratio stayed constant between two years, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally stayed constant or near-constant between those years.  *Id.*  For example, between the 2016-2017 and 2018-2019 school years, Boston College's student/faculty ratio *stayed constant* at 12/1 and its percentage of classes with fewer than twenty (20) students *stayed constant* at 49%.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2016-2017 through 2018-2019.   This comports with common sense, because when there is a constant number of students per faculty member, class sizes tend to stay constant and there tend to be the same number of small classes.

69.     In 2021-2022, Columbia represented to USNWR that its student/faculty ratio was 6/1 and that 83% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students.  After the publication of Professor Thaddeus' report, Columbia published a Common Data Set admitting that, in 2022, only 57% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students, but affirming that its 2021-2022 student/faculty ratio was 6/1.

70.     From 2011-2012 to 2021-2022, Columbia annually reported to USNWR that its student/faculty ratio was 6/1 and that at or near 83% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20)

students.

71.     In light of the inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students, Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission plausibly suggests that Columbia's representations to USNWR from 2011-2012 through 2021-2022 were false, and that the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in those years was not at or near 83%, but actually at or near 57%.

### Columbia Falsely Misrepresented Critical Data To USNWR In 2020-2021

72.     Upon information and belief, Columbia misrepresented to USNWR critical data that determined its USNWR ranking in 2020-2021, including, but not limited to, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students and/or its student/faculty ratio.

73.     Columbia was ranked third (3rd) on USNWR's rankings in 2020-2021.  *See* Exhibit A –Year 2020-2021.

74.     From 2020-2021 to 2021-2022, there existed an inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2020-2021 through 2021-2022.

75.     Where a university's student/faculty ratio increased between 2020-2021 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally decreased between 2021 and 2022.  *Id.*

76.     Where a university's student/faculty ratio decreased between 2020-2021 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally increased between 2020-2021 and 2021-2022.  *Id.*

77.     Where a university's student/faculty ratio stayed constant between 2020-2021 and

27

2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally stayed

constant or near-constant between 2020-2021 and 2021-2022.  *Id.*

78.     Columbia reported to USNWR that its student/faculty ratio was 6/1 and that 82%

of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students in 2020-2021.  *See* Exhibit A – Year 2020-

2021.

79.     Columbia had the highest percentage of classes with fewer than twenty (20)

students of any university on USNWR's rankings in 2020-2021. *Id.*

80.     After the publication of Professor Thaddeus' report, Columbia published a

Common Data Set, which Provost Mary Boyce represented to be "accurate and complete,"[12]

admitting that, in 2021-2022, only 57% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students, but

affirming that its student/faculty ratio was 6/1.

81.     Per Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission, Columbia's student/faculty

ratio did not change from 2020-2021 to 2021-2022, but the percentage of its classes with fewer

than twenty (20) students dropped by 26-percentage points.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2020-2021

through 2021-2022; ¶¶ 47, 48, *supra*.

82.     From 2020-2021 to 2021-2022, no university listed on the USNWR rankings, let

alone a university like Columbia whose student/faculty ratio stayed constant during those years,

experienced anything close to a 25-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes with

fewer than twenty (20) students.

83.     Columbia has provided no legitimate explanation for the 25-percentage point drop

in the percentage of its classes from fewer than twenty (20) students from 2020-2021 to 2021-

---

[12]     *Provost Mary Boyce Announces Release of Two Common Data Sets.* Office of the Provost. (Sept.
9, 2022) https://provost.columbia.edu/statement-common-data-set (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

2022.

84.     These facts plausibly suggest that contrary to Columbia's prior representations to USNWR, the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2020-2021 was not 82%, but actually at or near 57%.

85.     In sum, in light of the previously demonstrated inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students, Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission plausibly suggests that Columbia's 2020-2021 representations to USNWR were false, and that the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2020-2021 was not 82%, but actually at or near 57%.

86.     Additional facts concerning the truth of the matter are within the exclusive dominion, possession and control of Defendant.

**Columbia Falsely Misrepresented Critical Data To USNWR In 2019-2020**

87.     Upon information and belief, Columbia misrepresented to USNWR critical data that determined its USNWR ranking in 2019-2020, including, but not limited to, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students and/or its student/faculty ratio.

88.     Columbia was ranked third (3rd) on USNWR's rankings in 2019-2020.  *See* Exhibit A –Year 2019-2020.

89.     From 2019-2020 to 2021-2022, there existed an inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2019-2020 through 2021-2022.

90.     Where a university's student/faculty ratio increased between 2019-2020 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally

decreased between 2019-2020 and 2021-2022. *Id*.

91.     Where a university's student/faculty ratio decreased between 2019-2020 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally increased between 2019-2020 and 2021-2022. *Id.*

92.     Where a university's student/faculty ratio stayed constant between 2019-2020 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally stayed constant or near-constant between 2019-2020 and 2021-2022. *Id*.

93.     Columbia reported to USNWR that its student/faculty ratio was 6/1 and that 82% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students in 2019-2020.  *See* Exhibit A – Year 2019-2020.

94.     Columbia had the highest percentage of classes with fewer than twenty (20) students of any university on USNWR's rankings in 2019-2020. *Id.*

95.     After the publication of Professor Thaddeus' report, Columbia published a Common Data Set, which Provost Mary Boyce represented to be "accurate and complete,"[13] admitting that, in 2021-2022, only 57% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students, but affirming that, in 2021-2022, its student/faculty ratio was 6/1.

96.     Per Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission, Columbia's student/faculty ratio did not change from 2019-2020 to 2021-2022, but the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students dropped by 25-percentage points.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2019-2020 through 2021-2022; ¶¶ 47, 48, *supra*.

97.     From 2019-2020 to 2021-2022, no university listed on the USNWR rankings, let

---

[13]     *Provost Mary Boyce Announces Release of Two Common Data Sets.* Office of the Provost. (Sept. 9, 2022) https://provost.columbia.edu/statement-common-data-set (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

alone a university like Columbia whose student/faculty ratio stayed constant during those years, experienced anything close to a 25-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.

98.     Columbia has provided no legitimate explanation for the 25-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes from fewer than twenty (20) students from 2019-2020 to 2021-2022.

99.     These facts plausibly suggest that contrary to Columbia's prior representations to USNWR, the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2019-2020 was not 82%, but actually at or near 57%.

100.    In sum, in light of the previously demonstrated inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students, Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission plausibly suggests that Columbia's 2019-2020 representations to USNWR were false, and that the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2019-2020 was not 82%, but actually at or near 57%.

101.    Additional facts concerning the truth of the matter are within the exclusive dominion, possession and control of Defendant.

### Columbia Falsely Misrepresented Critical Data To USNWR In 2018-2019

102.    Upon information and belief, Columbia misrepresented to USNWR critical data that determined its USNWR ranking in 2018-2019, including, but not limited to, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students and/or its student/faculty ratio.

103.    Columbia was ranked third (3rd) on USNWR's rankings in 2018-2019.  *See* Exhibit A −Year 2018-2019.

104.    From 2018-2019 to 2021-2022, there existed an inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2018-2019 through 2021-2022.

105.    Where a university's student/faculty ratio increased between 2018-2019 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally decreased between 2018-2019 and 2021-2022. *Id.*

106.    Where a university's student/faculty ratio decreased between 2018-2019 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally increased between 2018-2019 and 2021-2022. *Id.*

107.    Where a university's student/faculty ratio stayed constant between 2018-2019 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally stayed constant or near-constant between 2018-2019 and 2021-2022. *Id.*

108.    Columbia reported to USNWR that its student/faculty ratio was 6/1 and that 82% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students in 2018-2019.  *See* Exhibit A – Year 2018-2019.

109.    Columbia had the highest percentage of classes with fewer than twenty (20) students of any university on USNWR's rankings in 2018-2019. *Id.*

110.    After the publication of Professor Thaddeus' report, Columbia published a Common Data Set, which Provost Mary Boyce represented to be "accurate and complete,"[14] admitting that, in 2021-2022, only 57% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students, but affirming that, in 2021-2022, its student/faculty ratio was 6/1.

---

[14]    *Provost Mary Boyce Announces Release of Two Common Data Sets.* Office of the Provost. (Sept. 9, 2022) https://provost.columbia.edu/statement-common-data-set (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

111.    Per Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission, Columbia's student/faculty

ratio did not change from 2018-2019 to 2021-2022, but the percentage of its classes with fewer

than twenty (20) students dropped by 25-percentage points.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2018-2019

through 2020-2021; ¶¶ 47, 48, *supra*.

112.    From 2018-2019 to 2021-2022, no university listed on the USNWR rankings, let

alone a university like Columbia whose student/faculty ratio stayed constant during those years,

experienced anything close to a 25-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes with

fewer than twenty (20) students.

113.    Columbia has provided no legitimate explanation for the 25-percentage point drop

in the percentage of its classes from fewer than twenty (20) students from 2018-2019 to 2021-

2022.

114.    These facts plausibly suggest that contrary to Columbia's prior representations to

USNWR, the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2018-

2019 was not 82%, but actually at or near 57%.

115.    In sum, in light of the previously demonstrated inverse correlation between

changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with

fewer than twenty (20) students, Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission plausibly

suggests that Columbia's 2018-2019 representations to USNWR were false, and that the

percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2018-2019 was not

82%, but actually at or near 57%.

116.    Additional facts concerning the truth of the matter are within the exclusive

dominion, possession and control of Defendant.

**Columbia Falsely Misrepresented Critical Data To USNWR In 2017-2018**

117.     Upon information and belief, Columbia misrepresented to USNWR critical data that determined its USNWR ranking in 2017-2018, including, but not limited to, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students and/or its student/faculty ratio.

118.     Columbia was ranked fifth (5th) on USNWR's rankings in 2017-2018.  *See* Exhibit A –Year 2017-2018.

119.     From 2017-2018 to 2021-2022, there existed an inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2017-2018 through 2021-2022.

120.     Where a university's student/faculty ratio increased between 2017-2018 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally decreased between 2017-2018 and 2021-2022.  *Id.*

121.     Where a university's student/faculty ratio decreased between 2017-2018 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally increased between 2017-2018 and 2021-2022.  *Id.*

122.     Where a university's student/faculty ratio stayed constant between 2017-2018 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally stayed constant or near-constant between 2017-2018 and 2021-2022.  *Id.*

123.     Columbia reported to USNWR that its student/faculty ratio was 6/1 and that 83% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students in 2017-2018.  *See* Exhibit A – Year 2017-2018.

124.     Columbia had the highest percentage of classes with fewer than twenty (20) students of any university on USNWR's rankings in 2017-2018. *Id.*

125.     After the publication of Professor Thaddeus' report, Columbia published a

Common Data Set, which Provost Mary Boyce represented to be "accurate and complete,"[15] admitting that, in 2021-2022, only 57% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students, but affirming that, in 2021-2022, its student/faculty ratio was 6/1.

126.    Per Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission, Columbia's student/faculty ratio did not change from 2017-2018 to 2021-2022, but the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students dropped by 26-percentage points. *See* Exhibit A – Years 2017-2018 through 2021-2022; ¶¶ 47, 48, *supra*.

127.    From 2017-2018 to 2021-2022, no university listed on the USNWR rankings, let alone a university like Columbia whose student/faculty ratio stayed constant during those years, experienced anything close to a 26-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.

128.    Columbia has provided no legitimate explanation for the 26-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes from fewer than twenty (20) students from 2017-2018 to 2021-2022.

129.    These facts plausibly suggest that contrary to Columbia's prior representations to USNWR, the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2017-2018 was not 83%, but actually at or near 57%.

130.    In sum, in light of the previously demonstrated inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students, Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission plausibly suggests that Columbia's 2017-2018 representations to USNWR were false, and that the

---

[15]     *Provost Mary Boyce Announces Release of Two Common Data Sets.* Office of the Provost. (Sept. 9, 2022) https://provost.columbia.edu/statement-common-data-set (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2017-2018 was not 83%, but actually at or near 57%.

131.    Additional facts concerning the truth of the matter are within the exclusive dominion, possession and control of Defendant.

**Columbia Falsely Misrepresented Critical Data To USNWR In 2016-2017**

132.    Upon information and belief, Columbia misrepresented to USNWR critical data that determined its USNWR ranking in 2016-2017, including, but not limited to, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students and/or its student/faculty ratio.

133.    Columbia was ranked fifth (5th) on USNWR's rankings in 2016-2017.  *See* Exhibit A –Year 2016-2017.

134.    From 2016-2017 to 2021-2022, there existed an inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2016-2017 through 2021-2022.

135.    Where a university's student/faculty ratio increased between 2016-2017 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally decreased between 2016-2017 and 2021-2022.  *Id.*

136.    Where a university's student/faculty ratio decreased between 2016-2017 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally increased between 2017 and 2022.  *Id.*

137.    Where a university's student/faculty ratio stayed constant between 2016-2017 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally stayed constant or near-constant between 2016-2017 and 2021-2022.  *Id.*

138.    Columbia reported to USNWR that its student/faculty ratio was 6/1 and that 83%

of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students in 2017.  *See* Exhibit A – Year 2016-2017.

139.    Columbia had the highest percentage of classes with fewer than twenty (20) students of any university on USNWR's rankings in 2016-2017. *Id.*

140.    After the publication of Professor Thaddeus' report, Columbia published a Common Data Set, which Provost Mary Boyce represented to be "accurate and complete,"[16] admitting that, in 2021-2022, only 57% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students, but affirming that, in 2021-2022, its student/faculty ratio was 6/1.

141.    Per Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission, Columbia's student/faculty ratio did not change from 2016-2017 and 2021-2022, but the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students dropped by 26-percentage points.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2016-2017 through 2021-2022; ¶¶ 47, 48, *supra*.

142.    From 2016-2017 to 2021-2022, no university listed on the USNWR rankings, let alone a university like Columbia whose student/faculty ratio stayed constant during those years, experienced anything close to a 26-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.

143.    Columbia has provided no legitimate explanation for the 26-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes from fewer than twenty (20) students from 2016-2017 to 2021-2022.

144.    These facts plausibly suggest that contrary to Columbia's prior representations to USNWR, the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2016-2017 was not 83%, but actually at or near 57%.

---

[16]     *Provost Mary Boyce Announces Release of Two Common Data Sets.* Office of the Provost. (Sept. 9, 2022) https://provost.columbia.edu/statement-common-data-set (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

145.    In sum, in light of the previously demonstrated inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students, Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission plausibly suggests that Columbia's 2017 representations to USNWR were false, and that the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2016-2017 was not 83%, but actually at or near 57%.

146.    Additional facts concerning the truth of the matter are within the exclusive dominion, possession and control of Defendant.

## Columbia Falsely Misrepresented Critical Data To USNWR In 2015-2016

147.    Upon information and belief, Columbia misrepresented to USNWR critical data that determined its USNWR ranking in 2015-2016, including, but not limited to, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students and/or its student/faculty ratio.

148.    Columbia was ranked fourth (4th) on USNWR's rankings in 2015-2016.  *See* Exhibit A –Year 2015-2016.

149.    From 2015-2016 to 2021-2022, there existed an inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2015-2016 through 2021-2022.

150.    Where a university's student/faculty ratio increased between 2015-2016 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally decreased between 2015-2016 and 2021-2022.  *Id.*

151.    Where a university's student/faculty ratio decreased between 2015-2016 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally increased between 2015-2016 and 2021-2022.  *Id.*

152.    Where a university's student/faculty ratio stayed constant between 2015-2016 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally stayed constant or near-constant between 2015-2016 and 2021-2022.  *Id.*

153.    Columbia reported to USNWR that its student/faculty ratio was 6/1 and that 82% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students in 2015-2016.  *See* Exhibit A – Year 2015-2016.

154.    Columbia had the highest percentage of classes with fewer than twenty (20) students of any university on USNWR's rankings in 2015-2016. *Id.*

155.    After the publication of Professor Thaddeus' report, Columbia published a Common Data Set, which Provost Mary Boyce represented to be "accurate and complete,"[17] admitting that, in 2021-2022, only 57% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students, but affirming that, in 2021-2022, its student/faculty ratio was 6/1.

156.    Per Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission, Columbia's student/faculty ratio did not change from 2015-2016 to 2021-2022, but the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students dropped by 25-percentage points.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2015-2016 through 2021-2022; ¶¶ 47, 48, *supra*.

157.    From 2015-2016 to 2021-2022, no university listed on the USNWR rankings, let alone a university like Columbia whose student/faculty ratio stayed constant during those years, experienced anything close to a 25-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.

158.    Columbia has provided no legitimate explanation for the 25-percentage point drop

---

[17]    *Provost Mary Boyce Announces Release of Two Common Data Sets.* Office of the Provost. (Sept. 9, 2022) https://provost.columbia.edu/statement-common-data-set (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

in the percentage of its classes from fewer than twenty (20) students from 2015-2016 to 2021-2022.

159.    These facts plausibly suggest that contrary to Columbia's prior representations to USNWR, the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2015-2016 was not 82%, but actually at or near 57%.

160.    In sum, in light of the previously demonstrated inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students, Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission plausibly suggests that Columbia's 2015-2016 representations to USNWR were false, and that the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2015-2016 was not 82%, but actually at or near 57%.

161.    Additional facts concerning the truth of the matter are within the exclusive dominion, possession and control of Defendant.

**Columbia Falsely Misrepresented Critical Data To USNWR In 2014-2015**

162.    Upon information and belief, Columbia misrepresented to USNWR critical data that determined its USNWR ranking in 2014-2015, including, but not limited to, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students and/or its student/faculty ratio.

163.    Columbia was ranked fourth (4th) on USNWR's rankings in 2014-2015.  *See* Exhibit A –Year 2014-2015.

164.    From 2014-2015 to 2021-2022, there existed an inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2014-2015 through 2021-2022.

165.    Where a university's student/faculty ratio increased between 2014-2015 and

2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally decreased between 2014-2015 and 2021-2022. *Id.*

166. Where a university's student/faculty ratio decreased between 2014-2015 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally increased between 2014-2015 and 2021-2022. *Id.*

167. Where a university's student/faculty ratio stayed constant between 2014-2015 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally stayed constant or near-constant between 2014-2015 and 2021-2022. *Id.*

168. Columbia reported to USNWR that its student/faculty ratio was 6/1 and that 82% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students in 2014-2015. *See* Exhibit A – Year 2014-2015.

169. Columbia had the highest percentage of classes with fewer than twenty (20) students of any university on USNWR's rankings in 2014-2015. *Id.*

170. After the publication of Professor Thaddeus' report, Columbia published a Common Data Set, which Provost Mary Boyce represented to be "accurate and complete,"[18] admitting that, in 2021-2022, only 57% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students, but affirming that, in 2021-2022, its student/faculty ratio was 6/1.

171. Per Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission, Columbia's student/faculty ratio did not change from 2014-2015 to 2021-2022, but the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students dropped by 25-percentage points. *See* Exhibit A – Years 2014-2015 through 2021-2022; ¶¶ 47, 48, *supra*.

---

[18] *Provost Mary Boyce Announces Release of Two Common Data Sets.* Office of the Provost. (Sept. 9, 2022) https://provost.columbia.edu/statement-common-data-set (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

172.     From 2014-2015 to 2021-2022, no university listed on the USNWR rankings, let alone a university like Columbia whose student/faculty ratio stayed constant during those years, experienced anything close to a 25-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.

173.     Columbia has provided no legitimate explanation for the 25-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes from fewer than twenty (20) students from 2014-2015 to 2021-2022.

174.     These facts plausibly suggest that contrary to Columbia's prior representations to USNWR, the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2014-2015 was not 82%, but actually at or near 57%.

175.     In sum, in light of the previously demonstrated inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students, Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission plausibly suggests that Columbia's 2014-2015 representations to USNWR were false, and that the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2014-2015 was not 82%, but actually at or near 57%.

176.     Additional facts concerning the truth of the matter are within the exclusive dominion, possession and control of Defendant.

### Columbia Falsely Misrepresented Critical Data To USNWR In 2013-2014

177.     Upon information and belief, Columbia misrepresented to USNWR critical data that determined its USNWR ranking in 2013-2014, including, but not limited to, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students and/or its student/faculty ratio.

178.     Columbia was ranked fourth (4th) on USNWR's rankings in 2013-2014.   *See*

Exhibit A –Year 2013-2014.

179.    From 2013-2014 to 2021-2022, there existed an inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.  *See* Exhibit A − Years 2013-2014 through 2021-2022.

180.    Where a university's student/faculty ratio increased between 2013-2014 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally decreased between 2013-2014 and 2021-2022. *Id.*

181.    Where a university's student/faculty ratio decreased between 2013-2014 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally increased between 2013-2014 and 2021-2022. *Id.*

182.    Where a university's student/faculty ratio stayed constant between 2013-2014 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally stayed constant or near-constant between 2013-2014 and 2021-2022. *Id.*

183.    Columbia reported to USNWR that its student/faculty ratio was 6/1 and that 80% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students in 2013-2014.  *See* Exhibit A − Year 2013-2014.

184.    Columbia had the highest percentage of classes with fewer than twenty (20) students of any university on USNWR's rankings in 2013-2014. *Id.*

185.    After the publication of Professor Thaddeus' report, Columbia published a Common Data Set, which Provost Mary Boyce represented to be "accurate and complete,"[19] admitting that, in 2021-2022, only 57% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students, but

---

[19]     *Provost Mary Boyce Announces Release of Two Common Data Sets.* Office of the Provost. (Sept. 9, 2022) https://provost.columbia.edu/statement-common-data-set (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

affirming that, in 2021-2022, its student/faculty ratio was 6/1.

186.    Per Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission, Columbia's student/faculty ratio did not change from 2013-2014 and 2021-2022, but the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students dropped by 25-percentage points.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2013-2014 through 2021-2022; ¶¶ 47, 48, *supra*.

187.    From 2013-2014 to 2021-2022, no university listed on the USNWR rankings, let alone a university like Columbia whose student/faculty ratio stayed constant during those years, experienced anything close to a 25-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.

188.    Columbia has provided no legitimate explanation for the 25-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes from fewer than twenty (20) students from 2013-2014 to 2021-2022.

189.    These facts plausibly suggest that contrary to Columbia's prior representations to USNWR, the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2013-2014 was not 80%, but actually at or near 57%.

190.    In sum, in light of the previously demonstrated inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students, Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission plausibly suggests that Columbia's 2013-2014 representations to USNWR were false, and that the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2013-2014 was not 80%, but actually at or near 57%.

191.    Additional facts concerning the truth of the matter are within the exclusive dominion, possession and control of Defendant.

**Columbia Falsely Misrepresented Critical Data To USNWR In 2012-2013**

192.   Upon information and belief, Columbia misrepresented to USNWR critical data that determined its USNWR ranking in 2012-2013, including, but not limited to, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students and/or its student/faculty ratio.

193.   Columbia was ranked fourth (4th) on USNWR's rankings in 2012-2013.  *See* Exhibit A –Year 2012-2013.

194.   From 2012-2013 to 2021-2022, there existed an inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2012-2013 through 2021-2022.

195.   Where a university's student/faculty ratio increased between 2012-2013 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally decreased between 2012-2013 and 2021-2022. *Id.*

196.   Where a university's student/faculty ratio decreased between 2012-2013 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally increased between 2012-2013 and 2021-2022. *Id.*

197.   Where a university's student/faculty ratio stayed constant between 2012-2013 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally stayed constant or near-constant between 2012-2013 and 2021-2022. *Id.*

198.   Columbia reported to USNWR that its student/faculty ratio was 6/1 and that 81% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students in 2012-2013.  *See* Exhibit A – Year 2012-2013.

199.   Columbia had the highest percentage of classes with fewer than twenty (20) students of any university on USNWR's rankings in 2012-2013. *Id.*

200.    After the publication of Professor Thaddeus' report, Columbia published a Common Data Set, which Provost Mary Boyce represented to be "accurate and complete,"[20] admitting that, in 2021-2022, only 57% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students, but affirming that, in 2021-2022, its student/faculty ratio was 6/1.

201.    Per Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission, Columbia's student/faculty ratio did not change from 2012-2013 to 2021-2022, but the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students dropped by 24-percentage points.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2012-2013 through 2021-2022; ¶¶ 47, 48, *supra*.

202.    From 2012-2013 to 2021-2022, no university listed on the USNWR rankings, let alone a university like Columbia whose student/faculty ratio stayed constant during those years, experienced anything close to a 24-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.

203.    Columbia has provided no legitimate explanation for the 24-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes from fewer than twenty (20) students from 2012-2013 to 2021-2022.

204.    These facts plausibly suggest that contrary to Columbia's prior representations to USNWR, the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2012-2013 was not 81%, but actually at or near 57%.

205.    In sum, in light of the previously demonstrated inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students, Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission plausibly

---

[20]     *Provost Mary Boyce Announces Release of Two Common Data Sets.* Office of the Provost. (Sept. 9, 2022) https://provost.columbia.edu/statement-common-data-set (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

suggests that Columbia's 2012-2013 representations to USNWR were false, and that the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2012-2013 was not 81%, but actually at or near 57%.

206. Additional facts concerning the truth of the matter are within the exclusive dominion, possession and control of Defendant.

## Columbia Falsely Misrepresented Critical Data To USNWR In 2011-2012

207. Upon information and belief, Columbia misrepresented to USNWR critical data that determined its USNWR ranking in 2011-2012, including, but not limited to, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students and/or its student/faculty ratio.

208. Columbia was ranked fourth (4th) on USNWR's rankings in 2011-2012. *See* Exhibit A −Year 2011-2012.

209. From 2011-2012 to 2021-2022, there existed an inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students. *See* Exhibit A – Years 2011-2012 through 2021-2022.

210. Where a university's student/faculty ratio increased between 2011-2012 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally decreased between 2012 and 2022. *Id.*

211. Where a university's student/faculty ratio decreased between 2011-2012 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally increased between 2011-2012 and 2021-2022. *Id.*

212. Where a university's student/faculty ratio stayed constant between 2011-2012 and 2021-2022, the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students generally stayed constant or near-constant between 2011-2012 and 2021-2022. *Id.*

213.     Columbia reported to USNWR that its student/faculty ratio was 6/1 and that 80% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students in 2011-2012.  *See* Exhibit A – Year 2011-2012.

214.     Columbia had the highest percentage of classes with fewer than twenty (20) students of any university on USNWR's rankings in 2011-2012. *Id.*

215.     After the publication of Professor Thaddeus' report, Columbia published a Common Data Set, which Provost Mary Boyce represented to be "accurate and complete,"[21] admitting that, in 2021-2022, only 57% of its classes had fewer than twenty (20) students, but affirming that, in 2021-2022, its student/faculty ratio was 6/1.

216.     Per Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission, Columbia's student/faculty ratio did not change from 2011-2012 to 2021-2022, but the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students dropped by 23-percentage points.  *See* Exhibit A – Years 2011-2012 through 2021-2022; ¶¶ 47, 48, *supra*.

217.     From 2011-2012 to 2021-2022, no university listed on the USNWR rankings, let alone a university like Columbia whose student/faculty ratio stayed constant during those years, experienced anything close to a 23-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students.

218.     Columbia has provided no legitimate explanation for the 23-percentage point drop in the percentage of its classes from fewer than twenty (20) students from 2011-2012 to 2021-2022.

219.     These facts plausibly suggest that contrary to Columbia's prior representations to

---

[21]     *Provost Mary Boyce Announces Release of Two Common Data Sets.* Office of the Provost. (Sept. 9, 2022) https://provost.columbia.edu/statement-common-data-set (Last visited on November 2, 2022).

USNWR, the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2011-2012 was not 80%, but actually at or near 57%.

220.   In sum, in light of the previously demonstrated inverse correlation between changes in a university's student/faculty ratio and changes in the percentage of its classes with fewer than twenty (20) students, Columbia's 2022 Common Data Set submission plausibly suggests that Columbia's 2011-2012 representations to USNWR were false, and that the percentage of Columbia's classes with fewer than twenty (20) students in 2011-2012 was not 80%, but actually at or near 57%.

221.   Additional facts concerning the truth of the matter are within the exclusive dominion, possession and control of Defendant.

## CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

222.   This action is brought and may be properly maintained as a class action pursuant to The Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1332.

223.   This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action against Defendant pursuant to the provisions of Rule 23 of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, because there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the proposed Class is easily ascertainable.

224.   Plaintiffs bring this action individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, and seek certification of a Class, defined as: "All persons who enrolled as students at Columbia from 2011 to 2022."

225.   The following are excluded from the Class: Columbia, its affiliates, employees, officers and directors, heirs, successors and their assigns of any such person or entity, together with any immediate family member of any officers, directors, employee of said persons and/or

entities, persons or entities that distribute or sell Columbia products or programs, the Judge(s) assigned to this case, and the attorneys of record in this case.  Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend the Class definition if discovery and further investigation reveal that the Class should be expanded or otherwise modified.

226.    Plaintiffs do not know the exact size of the Class, but it is reasonably estimated that the Class is composed of many more than 30,000 persons.  While the identities of Class members are unknown at this time, this information can be readily ascertained through appropriate discovery of the records maintained by Columbia.

227.    This action is properly brought as a class action because the proposed Class is so numerous and geographically dispersed throughout the United States that the joinder of all Class members is impracticable.

228.    This action is properly brought as a class action because the disposition of Plaintiffs' and proposed Class members' claims in a class action will provide substantial benefits to both the parties and the Court.

229.    This action is properly brought as a class action because the proposed Class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law or fact alleged herein since the rights of each proposed Class member were infringed or violated in the same fashion.

230.    This action is properly brought as a class action because there are questions of law and fact common to the proposed Class, which predominate over any questions that may affect particular Class members.

231.    Such common questions of law and fact include, but are not limited to:

(a)    Whether Columbia is engaged in unlawful, unfair, deceptive practices in

50

violation of GBL § 349 by engaging in the activities described herein;

(b)     Whether Columbia is engaged in unlawful, unfair, deceptive practices in violation of GBL § 350 by engaging in the activities described herein;

(c)     Whether Columbia breached its contract with Plaintiffs and the Class members;

(d)     Whether Columbia was unjustly enriched by its wrongful acts and conduct;

(e)     Whether Plaintiffs and the Class members have been harmed and the proper measure of relief, including damages;

(f)     Whether Plaintiffs and the Class members are entitled to an award of attorneys' fees and expenses; and

(g)     Whether Plaintiffs and the Class members are entitled to equitable relief, and if so, the nature of such relief.

232.     Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the members of the proposed Class. Plaintiffs and the Class members have been injured by the same wrongful practices of Columbia. Plaintiffs' claims arise from the same practices and conduct that give rise to the claims of all the Class members and are based on the same legal theories.

233.     Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class in that they have no interests antagonistic to those of the other Class members and Plaintiffs have retained attorneys experienced in class actions and complex litigation as counsel.

234.     A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy for at least the following reasons:

(a)     Given the size of the individual Class members' claims and the expense of

litigating those claims, few, if any, Class members could afford to or would seek legal redress individually for the wrongs Defendant committed against them, and absent the Class action, have no substantial interest in individually controlling the prosecution of individual actions;

(b)      This action will promote an orderly and expeditious administration and adjudication of the proposed Class claims, economies of time, effort and resources will be fostered, and uniformity of decisions will be insured; and

(c)      Plaintiffs are not aware of any difficulty that will be encountered in the management of this litigation, which would preclude Class certification.

235.    A class action is a superior and cost-effective method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the present controversy and there would accrue enormous savings to both the Court and the Class in litigating the common issues on a Class wide basis, instead of on a repetitive individual basis.

236.    The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members would run the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications, which would (a) establish incompatible standards of conduct of Defendant in this action and (b) create the risk that adjudications with respect to individual Class members would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to the adjudications or substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests.  Prosecution as a class action will eliminate the possibility of repetitious litigation.

## FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### (Violation of New York General Business Law, N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 349)

237.    Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each of the allegations set forth above, as if fully set forth herein.

238.    Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the other Class members.

239.    GBL § 349 provides for consumer protection by declaring as unlawful "[d]eceptive acts or practices in the conduct of any business, trade or commerce or in the furnishing of any service in this state . . . ."

240.    Columbia is a private university, which, among other things, is in the business of marketing and delivering educational services and degrees to the general public.

241.    Plaintiffs and the Class members are consumers of educational services, who have paid substantial tuition and fees to Defendant.

242.    Columbia's efforts to sell its services to prospective students, which included Plaintiffs and the Class members, were "consumer-oriented."

243.    Columbia is subject to the same laws, both statutory and common law, which govern other purveyors of goods and services in New York.

244.    Columbia is engaged in unlawful, unfair, deceptive practices in violation of GBL § 349 by engaging in the activities described herein.

245.    As part of its marketing practices and recruitment efforts, Defendant made numerous statements, representations and omissions to the public, including Plaintiffs and the Class members, with respect to Columbia's USNWR ranking.

246.    Such statements, representations and omissions, which were uniform and identical in nature, were intended to induce potential students, including Plaintiffs and the Class members, to enroll at Columbia.

247.    Defendant's statements, representations and omissions were material to the decisions by Plaintiffs and the Class members to enroll and attend Columbia, and proximately caused them to pay premiums for tuition, fees and costs.  However, the presence or absence of a

price premium attributable to Defendant's deception is objective and does not depend on whether Plaintiffs could have or would have, in fact, purchased a lower-priced, truthfully marketed alternative.

248.    The aforementioned statements, representations and omissions made by Columbia were objectively false, misleading and deceptive to Plaintiffs and the Class members.

249.    Defendant's above-alleged actions constitute unfair business practices since the actions were deceptive and injurious to Plaintiffs and the Class members because they enrolled as students at Columbia with the reasonable expectation that they would be entitled to benefits of attending a USNWR top-ranked educational institution, with class sizes, faculty resources, student-faculty ratios, graduation and retention rates, and financial resources supportive of its USNWR ranking.

250.    In fact, Plaintiffs and the Class members did not receive the benefit of attending a USNWR top-ranked educational institution, with class sizes, faculty resources, student-faculty ratios, graduation and retention rates, and financial resources supportive of its USNWR ranking.

251.    Defendant violated GBL § 349 by engaging in deceptive acts or practices in the conduct of its business with Plaintiffs and the Class members.

252.    At all relevant times, Columbia's ranking by USNWR was a false representation of fact, based upon fabricated data provided to USNWR by Defendant.

253.    At all relevant times, Columbia's ranking by USNWR was based upon misreported data and deceptive reporting practices.

254.    Defendant's unfair competition and deceptive practices actually deceived or had the tendency to deceive its student body, including Plaintiffs and the Class members.

255.    At all relevant times, Columbia's false representations and misreporting of critical

data to USNWR was necessary for it to retain its top USNWR ranking.

256.    At all relevant times, Columbia's top USNWR ranking provided significant leverage to enable Columbia to increase enrollment and tuition.

257.    At all relevant times, Columbia's failure to achieve a top USNWR ranking was likely to make a difference in the purchasing decisions of its prospective applicants.

258.    Plaintiffs and the Class members had no means of knowing or learning that Defendant was engaged in the unfair methods of competition and deceptive acts or practices described herein.

259.    If Plaintiffs and/or the Class members had knowledge of Defendant's unfair methods of competition and deceptive acts or practices described herein, they would not have applied for admission to Columbia.

260.    If Plaintiffs and/or the Class members had knowledge of Defendant's unfair methods of competition and deceptive acts or practices described herein, they would not have agreed to pay premiums for tuition, fees and costs based upon Columbia's USNWR ranking.

261.    Defendant's violations of GBL § 349, as described herein, have directly caused Plaintiffs and the Class members to suffer ascertainable losses.

262.    Defendant's violations of GBL § 349, as described herein, have directly caused Plaintiffs and Class members to have suffered ascertainable loss for damages measured by the incremental difference between the tuition and fees Plaintiffs and the Class members actually paid Defendant, and the amount of tuition and fees they would have paid Defendant or other institutions that they could have enrolled in, had the representations underlying Columbia's ranking been true.

263.    Plaintiffs and the Class members paid a premium for tuition and other fees to

attend Columbia, a USNWR top-ranked educational institution, with class sizes, faculty

resources, student-faculty ratios, graduation and retention rates, and financial resources

supportive of its USNWR ranking.

264.   In fact, Plaintiffs and the Class members did not receive the benefit of attending a

USNWR top-ranked educational institution, with class sizes, faculty resources, student-faculty

ratios, graduation and retention rates, and financial resources supportive of its USNWR ranking.

265.   As a proximate result of Defendant's violations of GBL § 349, Defendant is liable

to Plaintiffs and the Class members for compensatory damages.

266.   As a proximate result of Defendant's violations of GBL § 349, Defendant is liable

to Plaintiffs and the Class members for consequential damages.

267.   By reason of the foregoing, Plaintiffs and the Class members have sustained

damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

## SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### (Violation of New York General Business Law,
### N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 350)

268.   Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each of the allegations set forth

above, as if fully set forth herein.

269.   Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the other Class members.

270.   New York's General Business Law § 350 makes unlawful "[f]alse advertising in

the conduct of any business, trade, or commerce[.]" False advertising includes "advertising

including, labeling, of a commodity . . . if such advertising is misleading in a material respect,"

taking into account "the extent to which the advertising fails to reveal facts material in the light .

. . representations [made] with respect to the commodity. . . ." N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 350-a.

271.   Defendant caused to be made or disseminated, through advertising, marketing,

and other publications, statements that were untrue or misleading, and which were known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should have been known to Defendant, to be untrue and misleading to consumers, including Plaintiffs and the other Class members.

272.   Defendant misrepresented through advertisements its class sizes, faculty resources, student-faculty ratios, graduation and retention rates, and financial resources supportive of its USNWR ranking.

273.   Defendant knew or should have known that its class sizes, faculty resources, student-faculty ratios, graduation and retention rates, and financial resources supportive of its USNWR ranking were false and misleading, and in fact admitted that it was.

274.   Defendant has violated N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 350 because the misrepresentations and omissions regarding its class sizes, faculty resources, student-faculty ratios, graduation and retention rates, and financial resources supportive of its USNWR ranking were material and likely to deceive a reasonable consumer.

275.   As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's false and misleading advertising Plaintiffs and the other Class members suffered injury.

276.   Plaintiffs and the other Class members have suffered and will continue to suffer injury, ascertainable losses of money, and monetary and nonmonetary damages because Plaintiffs and the other Class members overpaid for Defendant's tuition because Defendant was not truly as highly ranked as Defendant's misrepresentations made it seem, as the information Defendant provided to USNWR regarding its class sizes, faculty resources, student-faculty ratios, graduation and retention rates, and financial resources supportive of its USNWR ranking were false and misleading.

277.   The above false and misleading advertising by Defendant caused substantial

injury to Plaintiffs and the other Class members that they could not reasonably avoid.

278.    Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of the other Class members, seek all monetary and non-monetary relief allowed by law, including actual damages or statutory damages of $500 per violation (whichever is greater), treble damages, injunctive relief, and attorney's fees and costs.

279.    Defendant committed a separate and independent violation of N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 350 for each false advertisement pertaining or relating to USNWR's ranking.

280.    Defendant should therefore be assessed statutory damages of $500 for each such violation, and all other such relief as may be just and proper.

281.    By reason of the foregoing, Plaintiffs and the Class members have sustained damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

## THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### (Breach of Contract)

282.    Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each of the allegations set forth above, as if fully set forth herein.

283.    Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the other Class members.

284.    The law recognizes that there is a contractual relationship between student and college, university or trade school.

285.    The subject contract imposed upon each party a duty of good faith and fair dealing in its performance and its enforcement, by embracing a pledge that neither party shall do anything which will have the effect of destroying or injuring the right of the other party to receive the fruits of the contract.

286.    Plaintiffs and each Class member performed their obligations under the contract

and complied with their duty of good faith and fair dealing.

287.    Defendant had a duty of good faith and fair dealing not to take opportunistic advantage of Plaintiffs and the Class members in a way that could not have been contemplated at the time of entering into the contract.

288.    Defendant had a duty of good faith and fair dealing to act in accordance with the agreed common purpose and consistent with the justified expectations of the other party, namely Plaintiffs and the Class members.

289.    Defendant breached this duty of good faith and fair dealing.

290.    Defendant breached its agreement with Plaintiffs and the Class members by misreporting data that were used to calculate its rankings to USNWR.

291.    Defendant breached its agreement with Plaintiffs and each Class member by representing to USNWR that it possessed certain characteristics, qualifications, requirements, benefits, and levels of attainment that it did not to actually possess.

292.    Plaintiffs and the Class members reasonably relied upon the fact that Defendant would truthfully and accurately submit information and critical data to USNWR.

293.    Plaintiffs and the Class members had no means of knowing or learning that Defendant was engaged in misreporting data that were used to calculate the rankings of educational institutions to USNWR.

294.    If Plaintiffs and/or the Class members had knowledge of Defendant's misreporting of data and deceptive practices described herein, they would not have applied for admission to Columbia.

295.    If Plaintiffs and/or the Class members had knowledge of Columbia's misreporting of data and deceptive practices described herein, they would not have agreed to pay premiums

for tuition, fees and costs based, in material part, upon Columbia's USNWR ranking.

296.    Defendant's above-described breaches of contract have raised grave concerns about the value of a Columbia degree.

297.    Defendant's above-described breaches of contract have raised grave concerns about the integrity of Columbia's administration.

298.    Defendant's above-described breaches of contract have raised grave concerns about the strength of Columbia's reputation.

299.    By reason of Defendant's above-described breaches of contract, Plaintiffs and the Class members have been damaged and sustained pecuniary injury.

300.    By reason of Defendant's above-described breaches of contract, Plaintiffs and the Class members have been deprived of the benefit of their bargain, equal to what Plaintiffs and the Class members would have received, if the representations underlying Columbia's ranking, had been true.

301.    By reason of Defendant's above-described breaches of contract, Plaintiffs and the Class members have sustained out of pocket damages for the incremental difference between the tuition and fees Plaintiffs and the Class Members actually paid, and the amount of tuition and fees they would have paid or other institutions that they could have enrolled in, had the representations underlying Columbia's ranking been true.

302.    By reason of Defendant's above-described breaches of contract, Plaintiffs and the Class members have sustained consequential damages in the nature of application fees, transaction fees and interest charges in connection with student loans.

303.    By reason of the foregoing, Plaintiffs and the Class members have sustained damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

## FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### (Unjust Enrichment)

304.     Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each of the allegations set forth above, as if fully set forth herein.

305.     Plaintiffs bring this claim individually and on behalf of the other Class members.

306.     A substantial factor in the decision of Plaintiffs and the Class members to enroll at Columbia was the prestige associated with Columbia's extremely high USNWR ranking.

307.     Plaintiffs and the Class members paid a premium for tuition and other fees to attend Columbia, a USNWR top-ranked educational institution, with class sizes, faculty resources, student-faculty ratios, graduation and retention rates, and financial resources that Columbia represented to be supportive of its USNWR ranking.

308.     In fact, Plaintiffs and the Class members did not receive the benefit of attending a USNWR top-ranked educational institution, with class sizes, faculty resources, student-faculty ratios, graduation and retention rates, and financial resources supportive of its USNWR ranking.

309.     Defendant's actions and conduct, as described herein, were false and misleading.

310.     As a result of the foregoing, Defendant was enriched at the expense of Plaintiffs and the Class members by Defendant's wrongful conduct and actions, and accordingly, it is against equity and good conscience to permit Defendant to retain such enrichment.

311.     Defendant is required to make restitution to Plaintiffs and the Class members.

312.     It would be inequitable and unjust for Defendant to retain the benefits it obtained without a return payment of value to Plaintiffs and the Class members.

313.     By reason of the foregoing, Plaintiffs and the Class members have sustained

damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, pray for Judgment as follows:

(A)     Certifying this case as a class action, with Plaintiffs as Class representatives and their attorneys (Gainey McKenna & Egleston) as Class counsel;

(B)     Awarding Judgment to Plaintiffs and the Class members for all available monetary damages and other relief;

(C)     Awarding Plaintiffs and the Class members their costs and disbursements, including reasonable attorney's fees;

(D)     Granting such other and further relief as may be deemed just and proper in the premises.

## DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs demand trial by jury in this action of all issues so triable.

Dated: November 15, 2022

**GAINEY McKENNA & EGLESTON**

By: /s/ *Thomas J. McKenna*
   Thomas J. McKenna
Gregory M. Egleston
501 Fifth Avenue, 19th Floor
New York, NY 10017
Telephone: (212) 983-1300
Facsimile: (212) 983-0383
Email: tjmckenna@gme-law.com
Email: gegleston@gme-law.com

*Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Putative Class*

**POULIN|WILLEY|ANASTOPOULO LAW FIRM, LLC**
Roy T. Willey IV (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
Paul Doolittle (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
Blake G. Abbott (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
32 Ann Street
Charleston, SC 29403
Telephone: (843) 614-8888
Email: roy@akimlawfirm.com
Email: pauld@akimlawfirm.com
Email: blake@akimlawfirm.com

*Counsel for Student A*

# EXHIBIT A

# Best National Universities

Year 2011-2012

| Rank School (State) (*Public) | Overall score | Undergraduate academic reputation index (100=highest) | Graduation and retention rank | Average freshman retention rate | 2010 graduation rate Predicted | 2010 graduation rate Actual | Over-performance(+) Under-performance (-) | Faculty resources rank | % of classes under 20 ('10) | % of classes of 50 or more ('10) | Student faculty ratio ('10) | % of faculty who are full time ('10) | Selectivity rank | SAT/ACT 25th-75th percentile ('10) | Freshmen in top 10% of HS class ('10) | Acceptance rate ('10) | Financial resources rank | Alumni giving rank | Average alumni giving rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Harvard University (MA) | 100 | 98 | 1 | 97% | 94% | 97% | +3 | 1 | 80% | 8% | 7/1 | 95% | 4 | 1390-1590 | 95% | 7% | 3 | 10 | 35% |
| 1. Princeton University (NJ) | 100 | 97 | 3 | 98% | 94% | 96% | +2 | 5 | 71% | 11% | 6/1 | 92% | 1 | 1400-1580 | 99%[5] | 9% | 10 | 1 | 61% |
| 3. Yale University (CT) | 98 | 97 | 1 | 99% | 94% | 96% | +2 | 8 | 76% | 7% | 5/1 | 100% | 2 | 1410-1590 | 97%[5] | 8% | 2 | 6 | 36% |
| 4. Columbia University (NY) | 94 | 93 | 6 | 99% | 93% | 96% | +3 | 3 | 80% | 7% | 6/1 | 92% | 4 | 1390-1570 | 97% | 10% | 10 | 17 | 33% |
| 5. California Institute of Technology | 93 | 92 | 24 | 98% | 94% | 90% | -4 | 11 | 64% | 10% | 3/1 | 98% | 4 | 1470-1580 | 96%[5] | 13% | 1 | 6 | 36% |
| 5. Massachusetts Inst. of Technology | 93 | 98 | 12 | 98% | 95% | 93% | -2 | 16 | 63% | 13% | 8/1 | 94% | 2 | 1410-1560 | 98%[5] | 10% | 6 | 12 | 35% |
| 5. Stanford University (CA) | 93 | 98 | 6 | 98% | 93% | 95% | +2 | 12 | 70% | 13% | 6/1 | 100% | 11 | 1360-1550 | 90%[5] | 7% | 12 | 13 | 34% |
| 5. University of Chicago | 93 | 92 | 16 | 98% | 92% | 92% | None | 2 | 78% | 5% | 7/1 | 85% | 13 | 1400-1560 | 89% | 19% | 8 | 16 | 33% |
| 5. University of Pennsylvania | 93 | 91 | 4 | 98% | 94% | 96% | +2 | 5 | 72% | 9% | 6/1 | 84% | 7 | 1350-1530 | 96% | 14% | 8 | 10 | 36% |
| 10. Duke University (NC) | 92 | 90 | 10 | 97% | 93% | 94% | +1 | 5 | 71% | 6% | 8/1 | 97% | 9 | 1350-1530 | 95%[5] | 16% | 13 | 6 | 36% |
| 11. Dartmouth College (NH) | 91 | 89 | 6 | 98% | 93% | 95% | +2 | 15 | 60% | 8% | 8/1 | 92% | 11 | 1360-1570 | 90%[5] | 12% | 15 | 2 | 49% |
| 12. Northwestern University (IL) | 90 | 89 | 10 | 97% | 92% | 94% | +2 | 4 | 75% | 6% | 7/1 | 97% | 13 | 1380-1530 | 91%[5] | 23% | 14 | 20 | 30% |
| 13. Johns Hopkins University (MD) | 89 | 93 | 19 | 97% | 92% | 92% | None | 20 | 68% | 11% | 9/1 | 98% | 15 | 1300-1510 | 87%[5] | 21% | 4 | 5 | 38% |
| 14. Washington University in St. Louis | 88 | 85 | 12 | 97% | 94% | 94% | None | 9 | 70% | 10% | 7/1 | 95% | 7 | 32-34 | 96%[5] | 21% | 4 | 22 | 29% |
| 15. Brown University (RI) | 87 | 91 | 6 | 98% | 93% | 96% | +3 | 20 | 68% | 10% | 9/1 | 93% | 9 | 1330-1530 | 93%[5] | 9% | 26 | 6 | 36% |
| 15. Cornell University (NY) | 87 | 93 | 16 | 96% | 92% | 93% | +1 | 19 | 54% | 19% | 11/1 | 98% | 15 | 1310-1500 | 90%[5] | 18% | 17 | 18 | 32% |
| 17. Rice University (TX) | 84 | 83 | 16 | 97% | 93% | 92% | -1 | 9 | 69% | 8% | 6/1 | 94% | 20 | 1340-1540 | 85% | 21% | 22 | 18 | 32% |
| 17. Vanderbilt University (TN) | 84 | 85 | 19 | 97% | 91% | 91% | None | 13 | 64% | 9% | 8/1 | 94% | 15 | 30-34 | 85%[5] | 18% | 15 | 32 | 23% |
| 19. University of Notre Dame (IN) | 83 | 83 | 4 | 98% | 92% | 96% | +4 | 16 | 55% | 10% | 12/1 | 97% | 20 | 31-34 | 87%[5] | 29% | 36 | 3 | 41% |
| 20. Emory University (GA) | 81 | 82 | 28 | 95% | 93% | 89% | -4 | 13 | 64% | 9% | 7/1 | 95% | 20 | 1310-1500 | 87%[5] | 29% | 20 | 13 | 34% |
| 21. University of California–Berkeley* | 79 | 93 | 24 | 97% | 88% | 91% | +3 | 30 | 62% | 15% | 17/1 | 90% | 15 | 1230-1490 | 98% | 22% | 36 | 111 | 12% |
| 22. Georgetown University (DC) | 78 | 85 | 12 | 96% | 93% | 93% | None | 33 | 61% | 5% | 11/1 | 76% | 15 | 1300-1490 | 91%[5] | 20% | 35 | 28 | 26% |
| 23. Carnegie Mellon University (PA) | 77 | 86 | 32 | 95% | 89% | 86% | -3 | 16 | 67% | 11% | 12/1 | 97% | 34 | 1300-1500 | 72%[5] | 33% | 28 | 57 | 17% |
| 23. Univ. of Southern California | 77 | 82 | 28 | 97% | 91% | 89% | -2 | 27 | 63% | 11% | 9/1 | 79% | 25 | 1270-1470 | 88%[5] | 24% | 29 | 4 | 39% |
| 25. Univ. of California–Los Angeles* | 76 | 84 | 24 | 97% | 86% | 90% | +4 | 36 | 52% | 22% | 16/1 | 92% | 20 | 1180-1440 | 97% | 23% | 23 | 104 | 13% |
| 25. University of Virginia* | 76 | 87 | 12 | 97% | 88% | 93% | +5 | 41 | 52% | 16% | 16/1 | 98% | 26 | 1220-1450 | 90%[5] | 33% | 60 | 40 | 22% |
| 25. Wake Forest University (NC) | 76 | 75 | 28 | 94% | 89% | 89% | None | 27 | 54% | 3% | 11/1 | 91% | 37 | 1213-1400[9] | 80% | 40% | 6 | 22 | 29% |
| 28. University of Michigan–Ann Arbor* | 75 | 89 | 27 | 96% | 87% | 90% | +3 | 59 | 48% | 16% | 15/1 | 93% | 27 | 27-31 | 92% | 51% | 36 | 79 | 15% |
| 29. Tufts University (MA) | 74 | 77 | 19 | 97% | 91% | 91% | None | 29 | 69% | 5% | 9/1 | 84% | 20 | 1350-1500 | 85% | 24% | 29 | 45 | 20% |
| 29. U. of North Carolina–Chapel Hill* | 74 | 85 | 32 | 97% | 85% | 90% | +5 | 59 | 37% | 13% | 14/1 | 97% | 37 | 1200-1410 | 78% | 32% | 29 | 35 | 22% |
| 31. Boston College | 70 | 77 | 19 | 96% | 90% | 91% | +1 | 51 | 47% | 6% | 14/1 | 78% | 31 | 1250-1430 | 79%[5] | 31% | 68 | 27 | 27% |
| 31. Brandeis University (MA) | 70 | 75 | 28 | 93% | 89% | 91% | +2 | 44 | 64% | 9% | 9/1 | 88% | 30 | 1270-1460 | 84% | 35% | 52 | 22 | 29% |
| 33. College of William and Mary (VA)* | 69 | 79 | 19 | 95% | 88% | 90% | +2 | 55 | 47% | 8% | 12/1 | 89% | 31 | 1260-1440 | 79%[5] | 32% | 97 | 34 | 23% |
| 33. New York University | 69 | 79 | 36 | 92% | 88% | 85% | -3 | 23 | 59% | 12% | 11/1 | 71% | 46 | 1240-1450 | 61%[5] | 38% | 36 | 167 | 8% |
| 35. University of Rochester (NY) | 68 | 71 | 38 | 96% | 89% | 84% | -5 | 25 | 69% | 11% | 10/1 | 86% | 34 | 1230-1420 | 79%[5] | 38% | 21 | 57 | 17% |
| 36. Georgia Institute of Technology* | 67 | 83 | 56 | 93% | 86% | 80% | -6 | 78 | 41% | 23% | 19/1 | 95% | 31 | 1240-1450 | 89% | 52% | 52 | 25 | 28% |
| 37. Univ. of California–San Diego* | 66 | 77 | 34 | 95% | 84% | 86% | +2 | 101 | 40% | 34% | 19/1 | 94% | 27 | 1150-1390 | 100% | 38% | 24 | 204 | 6% |
| 38. Case Western Reserve Univ. (OH) | 65 | 73 | 47 | 92% | 87% | 82% | -5 | 36 | 60% | 10% | 9/1 | 93% | 46 | 1250-1450 | 67% | 67% | 26 | 53 | 18% |
| 38. Lehigh University (PA) | 65 | 67 | 34 | 94% | 89% | 88% | -1 | 33 | 49% | 10% | 10/1 | 88% | 29 | 1220-1390 | 95%[5] | 38% | 52 | 35 | 22% |
| 38. University of California–Davis* | 65 | 75 | 47 | 91% | 79% | 84% | +5 | 72 | 36% | 24% | 15/1 | 97% | 34 | 1100-1340 | 100% | 45% | 29 | 151 | 9% |
| 38. University of Miami (FL) | 65 | 73 | 63 | 90% | 84% | 80% | -4 | 36 | 53% | 7% | 11/1 | 88% | 42 | 1210-1380 | 68%[5] | 39% | 24 | 57 | 17% |
| 42. Univ. of California–Santa Barbara* | 64 | 72 | 47 | 91% | 81% | 85% | +4 | 33 | 45% | 20% | 17/1 | 94% | 37 | 1110-1340 | 96% | 46% | 72 | 79 | 15% |
| 42. University of Washington* | 64 | 79 | 56 | 93% | 75% | 80% | +5 | 125 | 33% | 21% | 12/1 | 93% | 46 | 1090-1340 | 85%[5] | 57% | 29 | 79 | 15% |
| 42. Univ. of Wisconsin–Madison* | 64 | 81 | 41 | 94% | 82% | 84% | +2 | 72 | 45% | 19% | 17/1 | 94% | 53 | 26-30 | 56% | 57% | 49 | 123 | 11% |
| 45. Pennsylvania State U.–University Park* | 63 | 77 | 36 | 93% | 71% | 85% | +14 | 101 | 39% | 15% | 17/1 | 95% | 88 | 1090-1390 | 46% | 55% | 60 | 43 | 21% |
| 45. University of California–Irvine* | 63 | 73 | 41 | 94% | 84% | 83% | -1 | 44 | 47% | 19% | 19/1 | 93% | 42 | 1090-1320 | 96% | 45% | 45 | 180 | 8% |
| 45. U. of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign* | 63 | 79 | 38 | 94% | 80% | 84% | +4 | 85 | 34% | 21% | 16/1 | 100% | 56 | 26-31 | 56% | 67% | 60 | 104 | 13% |
| 45. University of Texas–Austin* | 63 | 82 | 51 | 92% | 80% | 81% | +1 | 109 | 34% | 25% | 18/1 | 97% | 50 | 1110-1370 | 76% | 47% | 79 | 95 | 14% |
| 45. Yeshiva University (NY) | 63 | 61 | 51 | 91% | 73% | 82% | +9 | 23 | 67% | 1% | 6/1 | 89% | 73 | 1070-1340 | 54% | 72% | 17 | 40 | 22% |
| 50. George Washington University (DC) | 62 | 75 | 51 | 92% | 85% | 81% | -4 | 70 | 55% | 10% | 13/1 | 69% | 40 | 1210-1390 | 74% | 32% | 60 | 157 | 9% |
| 50. Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst. (NY) | 62 | 73 | 41 | 92% | 88% | 82% | -6 | 72 | 43% | 15% | 16/1 | 92% | 42 | 1280-1450 | 65% | 40% | 44 | 84 | 15% |
| 50. Tulane University (LA) | 62 | 72 | 76 | 89% | 87% | 74%[8] | -13 | 22 | 67% | 6% | 11/1 | 81% | 42 | 1230-1400 | 60%[5] | 26% | 57 | 48 | 19% |

## What Is a National University?

To assess more than 1,500 of the country's four-year colleges and universities, *U.S. News* first assigns each to a group of its peers, based on the categories of higher education institutions developed in 2010 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The National Universities category consists of the 280 institutions (172 public, 101 private, and 7 for-profit) that offer a wide range of undergraduate majors as well as master's and doctoral degrees; some emphasize research. A list of the top 30 public national universities appears on Page 122.

Data on up to 16 indicators of academic quality are gathered from each institution and tabulated. Schools are ranked in categories by their total weighted score; those receiving the same rank are tied and listed in alphabetical order. For more on a college, turn to the directory at the back of the book or go to *www.usnews.com/bestcolleges.*

**Note:** Key to footnotes, Page 122.

# THE RANKINGS

# Best National Univers ities

Year 2012-2013

| Rank School (State) (*Public) | Overall score | Undergraduate academic reputation index (100=highest) | Graduation and retention rank | Average freshman retention rate | 2011 graduation rate Predicted | 2011 graduation rate Actual | Over-performance(+) Under-performance(-) | Faculty resources rank | % of classes under 20 ('11) | % of classes of 50 or more ('11) | Student/ faculty ratio ('11) | % of faculty who are full time ('11) | Selectivity rank | SAT/ACT 25th-75th percentile ('11) | Freshmen In top 10% of HS class ('11) | Acceptance rate ('11) | Financial resources rank | Alumni giving rank | Average alumni giving rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Harvard University (MA) | 100 | 98 | 1 | 98% | 96% | 97% | +1 | 1 | 78% | 8% | 7/1 | 95% | 5 | 1390-1590 | 95% | 6% | 3 | 9 | 36% |
| 1. Princeton University (NJ) | 100 | 97 | 3 | 98% | 95% | 96% | +1 | 8 | 71% | 11% | 6/1 | 92% | 5 | 1410-1590 | 93%[5] | 8% | 10 | 1 | 63% |
| 3. Yale University (CT) | 99 | 97 | 1 | 99% | 96% | 97% | +1 | 7 | 77% | 6% | 5/1 | 100% | 1 | 1400-1590 | 97%[5] | 8% | 2 | 4 | 37% |
| 4. Columbia University (NY) | 95 | 93 | 6 | 99% | 95% | 96% | +1 | 3 | 81% | 7% | 6/1 | 90% | 1 | 1390-1560 | 97% | 7% | 10 | 16 | 33% |
| 4. University of Chicago | 95 | 92 | 13 | 98% | 92% | 92% | None | 2 | 75% | 5% | 6/1 | 89% | 7 | 1400-1570 | 95% | 16% | 7 | 9 | 36% |
| 6. Massachusetts Inst. of Technology | 94 | 98 | 13 | 98% | 96% | 93% | -3 | 15 | 67% | 11% | 8/1 | 93% | 1 | 1410-1570 | 97%[5] | 10% | 8 | 4 | 37% |
| 6. Stanford University (CA) | 94 | 98 | 6 | 98% | 94% | 96% | +2 | 12 | 69% | 12% | 5/1 | 100% | 10 | 1360-1550 | 92%[5] | 7% | 12 | 9 | 35% |
| 8. Duke University (NC) | 93 | 91 | 6 | 97% | 94% | 94% | None | 4 | 72% | 6% | 7/1 | 97% | 14 | 1350-1530 | 90%[5] | 14% | 12 | 7 | 36% |
| 8. University of Pennsylvania | 93 | 90 | 4 | 98% | 95% | 96% | +1 | 5 | 72% | 9% | 6/1 | 84% | 7 | 1350-1530 | 96%[5] | 12% | 9 | 14 | 35% |
| 10. California Institute of Technology | 92 | 92 | 24 | 98% | 94% | 87% | -7 | 11 | 63% | 10% | 3/1 | 98% | 1 | 1460-1590 | 97%[5] | 13% | 1 | 9 | 35% |
| 10. Dartmouth College (NH) | 92 | 91 | 6 | 98% | 93% | 95% | +2 | 13 | 65% | 8% | 8/1 | 92% | 13 | 1350-1560 | 90%[5] | 10% | 16 | 2 | 50% |
| 12. Northwestern University (IL) | 91 | 89 | 11 | 97% | 93% | 94% | +1 | 5 | 75% | 7% | 7/1 | 97% | 10 | 31-34 | 92%[5] | 18% | 14 | 22 | 29% |
| 13. Johns Hopkins University (MD) | 90 | 94 | 19 | 97% | 92% | 92% | None | 20 | 67% | 10% | 9/1 | 97% | 20 | 1310-1510 | 86%[5] | 18% | 3 | 7 | 36% |
| 14. Washington University in St. Louis | 88 | 85 | 11 | 97% | 96% | 93% | -3 | 10 | 68% | 10% | 7/1 | 95% | 7 | 32-34 | 96%[5] | 17% | 3 | 22 | 29% |
| 15. Brown University (RI) | 87 | 91 | 6 | 98% | 94% | 95% | +1 | 18 | 70% | 10% | 9/1 | 94% | 10 | 1340-1520 | 91%[5] | 9% | 26 | 4 | 37% |
| 15. Cornell University (NY) | 87 | 94 | 13 | 97% | 91% | 93% | +2 | 20 | 57% | 18% | 9/1 | 97% | 20 | 1300-1500 | 89%[5] | 18% | 18 | 18 | 31% |
| 17. Rice University (TX) | 84 | 84 | 13 | 97% | 94% | 92% | -2 | 9 | 70% | 8% | 6/1 | 96% | 17 | 1330-1530 | 89% | 19% | 22 | 21 | 29% |
| 17. University of Notre Dame (IN) | 84 | 83 | 4 | 98% | 91% | 96% | +5 | 17 | 55% | 10% | 11/1 | 96% | 17 | 32-34 | 89%[5] | 24% | 32 | 3 | 41% |
| 17. Vanderbilt University (TN) | 84 | 86 | 19 | 97% | 91% | 92% | +1 | 15 | 62% | 8% | 8/1 | 92% | 14 | 31-34 | 89%[5] | 16% | 15 | 35 | 23% |
| 20. Emory University (GA) | 82 | 83 | 28 | 95% | 94% | 90% | -4 | 13 | 66% | 8% | 7/1 | 95% | 28 | 1280-1470 | 80%[5] | 27% | 18 | 15 | 34% |
| 21. Georgetown University (DC) | 79 | 86 | 13 | 96% | 94% | 94% | None | 35 | 59% | 7% | 12/1 | 77% | 20 | 1290-1490 | 90%[5] | 18% | 32 | 29 | 27% |
| 21. University of California–Berkeley* | 79 | 93 | 19 | 97% | 90% | 90% | None | 28 | 64% | 14% | 17/1 | 89% | 14 | 1250-1490 | 98% | 22% | 37 | 114 | 12% |
| 23. Carnegie Mellon University (PA) | 78 | 87 | 33 | 96% | 89% | 87% | -2 | 18 | 69% | 11% | 12/1 | 97% | 30 | 1310-1510 | 75%[5] | 30% | 29 | 52 | 18% |
| 24. Univ. of California–Los Angeles* | 77 | 86 | 24 | 97% | 87% | 90% | +3 | 35 | 51% | 22% | 17/1 | 91% | 25 | 1180-1440 | 97% | 25% | 22 | 107 | 13% |
| 24. Univ. of Southern California | 77 | 83 | 28 | 97% | 92% | 90% | -2 | 29 | 61% | 12% | 9/1 | 79% | 20 | 1280-1490 | 89%[5] | 23% | 28 | 17 | 32% |
| 24. University of Virginia* | 77 | 87 | 13 | 97% | 90% | 94% | +4 | 38 | 53% | 15% | 16/1 | 98% | 26 | 1240-1460 | 91%[5] | 33% | 53 | 37 | 22% |
| 27. Wake Forest University (NC) | 76 | 75 | 30 | 94% | 87% | 88% | +1 | 26 | 57% | 1% | 11/1 | 93% | 32 | 1230-1400[9] | 83% | 40% | 6 | 25 | 28% |
| 28. Tufts University (MA) | 75 | 79 | 19 | 97% | 92% | 90% | -2 | 27 | 69% | 6% | 9/1 | 86% | 17 | 1360-1500 | 89%[5] | 22% | 32 | 43 | 21% |
| 29. University of Michigan–Ann Arbor* | 74 | 88 | 24 | 96% | 89% | 90% | +1 | 66 | 48% | 17% | 16/1 | 93% | 24 | 28-32 | 95% | 41% | 39 | 61 | 17% |
| 30. U. of North Carolina–Chapel Hill* | 73 | 85 | 30 | 97% | 85% | 90% | +5 | 70 | 33% | 13% | 14/1 | 97% | 35 | 1200-1400 | 79% | 31% | 32 | 40 | 22% |
| 31. Boston College | 71 | 79 | 19 | 95% | 90% | 91% | +1 | 48 | 52% | 6% | 14/1 | 79% | 29 | 1260-1440 | 82%[5] | 28% | 72 | 29 | 26% |
| 32. New York University | 70 | 81 | 36 | 92% | 87% | 86% | -1 | 22 | 64% | 10% | 11/1 | 67% | 45 | 1260-1460 | 62%[5] | 33% | 39 | 168 | 8% |
| 33. Brandeis University (MA) | 69 | 77 | 30 | 93% | 90% | 91% | +1 | 42 | 62% | 8% | 10/1 | 88% | 45 | 1230-1450 | 64%[5] | 40% | 53 | 26 | 27% |
| 33. College of William and Mary (VA)* | 69 | 81 | 24 | 95% | 89% | 91% | +2 | 61 | 48% | 8% | 12/1 | 88% | 32 | 1240-1450 | 79%[5] | 35% | 112 | 33 | 24% |
| 33. University of Rochester (NY) | 69 | 73 | 38 | 95% | 88% | 83% | -5 | 25 | 69% | 12% | 10/1 | 90% | 39 | 1230-1440[2] | 74%[5] | 34% | 20 | 61 | 17% |
| 36. Georgia Institute of Technology* | 67 | 83 | 51 | 94% | 84% | 79% | -5 | 87 | 41% | 23% | 17/1 | 94% | 32 | 1260-1450 | 83% | 51% | 50 | 22 | 29% |
| 37. Case Western Reserve Univ. (OH) | 66 | 76 | 51 | 92% | 86% | 78% | -8 | 33 | 62% | 9% | 9/1 | 92% | 47 | 1240-1440 | 63%[5] | 51% | 26 | 48 | 19% |
| 38. Lehigh University (PA) | 65 | 69 | 33 | 94% | 90% | 87% | -3 | 38 | 48% | 10% | 10/1 | 88% | 26 | 1220-1400 | 96%[5] | 33% | 53 | 37 | 23% |
| 38. University of California–Davis* | 65 | 77 | 45 | 92% | 80% | 86% | +6 | 76 | 33% | 25% | 16/1 | 96% | 35 | 1090-1340 | 100% | 46% | 30 | 158 | 8% |
| 38. Univ. of California–San Diego* | 65 | 77 | 35 | 95% | 85% | 85% | None | 115 | 37% | 35% | 19/1 | 94% | 30 | 1110-1360 | 100% | 36% | 24 | 193 | 6% |
| 41. Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst. (NY) | 64 | 73 | 42 | 93% | 84% | 84% | None | 48 | 45% | 13% | 15/1 | 92% | 42 | 1290-1470 | 65% | 40% | 41 | 93 | 14% |
| 41. Univ. of California–Santa Barbara* | 64 | 72 | 48 | 91% | 83% | 86% | +3 | 29 | 47% | 19% | 17/1 | 94% | 35 | 1120-1360 | 96% | 46% | 70 | 80 | 15% |
| 41. Univ. of Wisconsin–Madison* | 64 | 83 | 42 | 94% | 80% | 83% | +3 | 87 | 44% | 20% | 17/1 | 93% | 54 | 26-30 | 58% | 50% | 53 | 132 | 10% |
| 44. University of California–Irvine* | 63 | 75 | 38 | 94% | 85% | 85% | None | 46 | 47% | 20% | 19/1 | 93% | 50 | 1060-1310 | 96% | 47% | 42 | 193 | 7% |
| 44. University of Miami (FL) | 63 | 69 | 63 | 90% | 83% | 78% | -5 | 38 | 52% | 7% | 11/1 | 90% | 39 | 1230-1400 | 72%[5] | 38% | 24 | 68 | 16% |
| 46. Pennsylvania State U.–University Park* | 62 | 77 | 36 | 92% | 70% | 87% | +17 | 106 | 38% | 15% | 17/1 | 95% | 87 | 1090-1300 | 45% | 52% | 59 | 71 | 16% |
| 46. U. of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign* | 62 | 79 | 38 | 94% | 78% | 82% | +4 | 76 | 34% | 20% | 18/1 | 100% | 59 | 26-31 | 52% | 68% | 67 | 102 | 13% |
| 46. University of Texas–Austin* | 62 | 83 | 51 | 92% | 80% | 81% | +1 | 115 | 33% | 26% | 18/1 | 97% | 47 | 1120-1380 | 73% | 47% | 80 | 93 | 14% |
| 46. University of Washington* | 62 | 77 | 51 | 93% | 80% | 80% | None | 150 | 34% | 21% | 13/1 | 92% | 42 | 1080-1350 | 92%[5] | 58% | 31 | 85 | 15% |
| 46. Yeshiva University (NY) | 62 | 61 | 51 | 91% | 77% | 85% | +8 | 24 | 70% | 0.4% | 6/1 | 86% | 81 | 1090-1360 | 51% | 69% | 17 | 41 | 21% |

>>>>>>
## What Is a National University?
>>>>>>

To assess more than 1,500 of the country's four-year colleges and universities, *U.S. News* first assigns each to a group of its peers, based on the categories of higher education institutions developed in 2010 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The National Universities category consists of the 281 institutions (173 public, 101 private, and seven for-profit) that offer a wide range of undergraduate majors as well as master's and doctoral degrees; some emphasize research. A list of the top 30 public national universities appears on Page 76. Data on up to 16 indicators of academic quality are gathered from each institution and tabulated. Schools are ranked in categories by their total weighted score; those receiving the same rank are tied and listed in alphabetical order. For more on a college, turn to the directory at the back of the book or go to *www. usnews.com/bestcolleges.*

Note: Key to footnotes, Page 76.

# Best National Universities

Year 2013-2014

| Rank School (State) (*Public) | Overall score | Peer assessment score | High school counselor assessment score | Graduation and retention rank | Average freshman retention rate | 2012 graduation rate Predicted | 2012 graduation rate Actual | Over-performance(+) Under-performance(-) | Facul resour rank | % of classes under 20 ('12) | % of classes of 50 or more ('12) | Student/faculty ratio ('12) | Selectivity rank | SAT/ACT 25th-75th percentile ('12) | Freshmen in top 10% of HS class ('12) | Acceptance rate ('12) | Financial resources rank | Alumni giving rank | Average alumni giving rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Princeton University (NJ) | 100 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 3 | 98% | 96% | 96% | None | 5 | 74% | 10% | 6/1 | 1 | 1410-1590 | 96%[5] | 8% | 10 | 1 | 62% |
| 2. Harvard University (MA) | 99 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 1 | 98% | 95% | 97% | +2 | 1 | 81% | 7% | 7/1 | 1 | 1410-1590 | 95% | 6% | 5 | 9 | 36% |
| 3. Yale University (CT) | 97 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 1 | 99% | 95% | 96% | +1 | 8 | 76% | 8% | 6/1 | 4 | 1410-1590 | 95%[5] | 7% | 2 | 6 | 37% |
| 4. Columbia University (NY) | 95 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4 | 99% | 95% | 97% | +2 | 2 | 80% | 4% | 6/1 | 4 | 1390-1570 | 94%[5] | 7% | 12 | 13 | 34% |
| 5. Stanford University (CA) | 94 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4 | 98% | 95% | 95% | None | 11 | 68% | 13% | 5/1 | 4 | 1380-1570 | 94%[5] | 7% | 9 | 9 | 36% |
| 5. University of Chicago | 94 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 14 | 99% | 93% | 92% | -1 | 2 | 77% | 6% | 6/1 | 4 | 1420-1570 | 97% | 13% | 6 | 4 | 38% |
| 7. Duke University (NC) | 92 | 4.4 | 4.7 | 10 | 97% | 95% | 95% | None | 4 | 71% | 6% | 7/1 | 12 | 1360-1550 | 92%[5] | 13% | 12 | 8 | 36% |
| 7. Massachusetts Inst. of Technology | 92 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 14 | 97% | 96% | 93% | -3 | 15 | 66% | 14% | 8/1 | 1 | 1410-1570 | 98%[5] | 9% | 7 | 6 | 37% |
| 7. University of Pennsylvania | 92 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 4 | 98% | 96% | 96% | None | 6 | 69% | 10% | 6/1 | 9 | 1350-1540 | 94%[5] | 13% | 10 | 14 | 33% |
| 10. California Institute of Technology | 91 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 25 | 98% | 94% | 92% | -2 | 12 | 59% | 11% | 3/1 | 4 | 1490-1580 | 94%[5] | 12% | 1 | 23 | 27% |
| 10. Dartmouth College (NH) | 91 | 4.3 | 4.8 | 4 | 98% | 95% | 96% | +1 | 13 | 63% | 7% | 8/1 | 12 | 1350-1560 | 90%[5] | 10% | 16 | 2 | 50% |
| 12. Johns Hopkins University (MD) | 89 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 18 | 97% | 93% | 94% | +1 | 17 | 68% | 12% | 10/1 | 21 | 1310-1510 | 84%[5] | 18% | 3 | 11 | 35% |
| 12. Northwestern University (IL) | 89 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 11 | 97% | 94% | 93% | -1 | 6 | 75% | 7% | 7/1 | 15 | 1390-1550 | 88%[5] | 15% | 14 | 23 | 27% |
| 14. Brown University (RI) | 87 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 4 | 98% | 95% | 95% | None | 15 | 69% | 9% | 8/1 | 12 | 1320-1530 | 92%[5] | 10% | 24 | 4 | 38% |
| 14. Washington University in St. Louis | 87 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 11 | 97% | 97% | 94% | -3 | 10 | 66% | 11% | 8/1 | 9 | 1420-1560 | 95%[5] | 18% | 3 | 18 | 29% |
| 16. Cornell University (NY) | 85 | 4.5 | 4.9 | 14 | 96% | 93% | 93% | None | 20 | 55% | 18% | 9/1 | 18 | 1310-1520 | 91%[5] | 17% | 18 | 17 | 30% |
| 17. Vanderbilt University (TN) | 84 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 18 | 96% | 92% | 92% | None | 13 | 63% | 9% | 8/1 | 9 | 32-34 | 90%[5] | 14% | 15 | 33 | 23% |
| 18. Rice University (TX) | 83 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 18 | 96% | 94% | 92% | -2 | 8 | 69% | 9% | 9/1 | 15 | 1360-1530 | 90% | 17% | 23 | 19 | 28% |
| 18. University of Notre Dame (IN) | 83 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 4 | 98% | 93% | 95% | +2 | 17 | 53% | 11% | 11/1 | 18 | 31-34 | 89%[5] | 23% | 29 | 3 | 41% |
| 20. Emory University (GA) | 79 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 25 | 95% | 94% | 90% | -4 | 17 | 58% | 8% | 7/1 | 26 | 1270-1460 | 80%[5] | 26% | 19 | 16 | 32% |
| 20. Georgetown University (DC) | 79 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 14 | 96% | 93% | 93% | None | 27 | 62% | 7% | 11/1 | 18 | 1310-1500 | 92%[5] | 17% | 32 | 23 | 27% |
| 20. University of California–Berkeley* | 79 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 21 | 97% | 89% | 91% | +2 | 32 | 63% | 15% | 17/1 | 24 | 1220-1490 | 98% | 18% | 37 | 105 | 12% |
| 23. Carnegie Mellon University (PA) | 76 | 4.2 | 4.7 | 34 | 96% | 91% | 87% | -4 | 20 | 68% | 10% | 13/1 | 26 | 1320-1520 | 76%[5] | 28% | 29 | 50 | 19% |
| 23. Univ. of California–Los Angeles* | 76 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 21 | 97% | 88% | 92% | +4 | 34 | 50% | 22% | 16/1 | 26 | 1180-1450 | 97% | 22% | 21 | 105 | 12% |
| 23. Univ. of Southern California | 76 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 25 | 97% | 92% | 90% | -2 | 40 | 57% | 14% | 9/1 | 22 | 1270-1480 | 88%[5] | 20% | 27 | 15 | 33% |
| 23. University of Virginia* | 76 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 11 | 97% | 90% | 93% | +3 | 38 | 54% | 16% | 16/1 | 24 | 1260-1460 | 93%[5] | 30% | 55 | 33 | 23% |
| 23. Wake Forest University (NC) | 76 | 3.5 | 4.4 | 31 | 94% | 89% | 87% | -2 | 27 | 59% | 2% | 11/1 | 32 | 1250-1410[2] | 79%[5] | 34% | 8 | 21 | 27% |
| 28. Tufts University (MA) | 74 | 3.6 | 4.5 | 21 | 96% | 93% | 92% | -1 | 32 | 69% | 6% | 9/1 | 15 | 1350-1520 | 90%[5] | 21% | 32 | 39 | 21% |
| 28. University of Michigan–Ann Arbor* | 74 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 25 | 96% | 90% | 91% | +1 | 77 | 46% | 18% | 16/1 | 22 | 28-32 | 65%[4] | 37% | 40 | 47 | 19% |
| 30. U. of North Carolina–Chapel Hill* | 72 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 31 | 97% | 86% | 89% | +3 | 68 | 37% | 13% | 14/1 | 34 | 1200-1400 | 79% | 28% | 36 | 37 | 21% |
| 31. Boston College | 70 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 21 | 95% | 91% | 92% | +1 | 48 | 52% | 7% | 13/1 | 26 | 1260-1450 | 81%[5] | 29% | 68 | 27 | 25% |
| 32. Brandeis University (MA) | 69 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 30 | 94% | 90% | 90% | None | 40 | 64% | 10% | 10/1 | 40 | 1230-1450 | 66%[5] | 39% | 52 | 26 | 26% |
| 32. College of William and Mary (VA)* | 69 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 25 | 95% | 88% | 90% | +2 | 57 | 49% | 9% | 12/1 | 30 | 1250-1460 | 79%[5] | 32% | 114 | 29 | 24% |
| 32. New York University | 69 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 36 | 92% | 87% | 85% | -2 | 23 | 63% | 10% | 10/1 | 40 | 1250-1450 | 64%[4] | 35% | 37 | 164 | 8% |
| 32. University of Rochester (NY) | 69 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 39 | 96% | 88% | 85% | -3 | 23 | 71% | 12% | 10/1 | 32 | 1240-1440[2] | 75%[5] | 35% | 20 | 56 | 18% |
| 36. Georgia Institute of Technology* | 67 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 56 | 94% | 84% | 79% | -5 | 95 | 42% | 23% | 18/1 | 36 | 1260-1460 | 74%[5] | 55% | 46 | 19 | 28% |
| 37. Case Western Reserve Univ. (OH) | 66 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 59 | 92% | 87% | 78% | -9 | 34 | 62% | 10% | 10/1 | 34 | 1260-1480 | 74%[5] | 54% | 26 | 44 | 20% |
| 37. Pennsylvania State U.–University Park* | 66 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 36 | 92% | 60% | 86% | +26 | 95 | 39% | 15% | 17/1 | 94 | 1090-1300 | 41% | 54% | 52 | 65 | 16% |
| 39. University of California–Davis* | 65 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 45 | 92% | 81% | 85% | +4 | 68 | 37% | 24% | 17/1 | 49 | 1090-1330 | 100% | 46% | 29 | 164 | 8% |
| 39. Univ. of California–San Diego* | 65 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 35 | 95% | 87% | 86% | -1 | 102 | 38% | 35% | 19/1 | 30 | 1170-1390 | 100% | 38% | 22 | 173 | 7% |
| 41. Boston University | 64 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 42 | 91% | 83% | 84% | +1 | 34 | 62% | 11% | 13/1 | 54 | 1180-1390 | 57%[5] | 46% | 49 | 147 | 9% |
| 41. Lehigh University (PA) | 64 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 33 | 94% | 91% | 88% | -3 | 43 | 47% | 12% | 10/1 | 44 | 1200-1400 | 64%[5] | 33% | 52 | 30 | 23% |
| 41. Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst. (NY) | 64 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 42 | 92% | 86% | 84% | -2 | 38 | 50% | 12% | 15/1 | 39 | 1270-1460 | 66% | 44% | 41 | 98 | 13% |
| 41. Univ. of California–Santa Barbara* | 64 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 49 | 91% | 83% | 86% | +3 | 29 | 49% | 18% | 17/1 | 40 | 1110-1350 | 100% | 44% | 68 | 65 | 16% |
| 41. U. of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign* | 64 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 39 | 94% | 80% | 84% | +4 | 59 | 42% | 20% | 19/1 | 54 | 26-31 | 54% | 63% | 67 | 129 | 10% |
| 41. Univ. of Wisconsin–Madison* | 64 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 42 | 95% | 81% | 83% | +2 | 95 | 46% | 20% | 17/1 | 53 | 26-30 | 56% | 55% | 55 | 137 | 10% |
| 47. University of Miami (FL) | 63 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 59 | 91% | 86% | 81% | -5 | 40 | 54% | 6% | 11/1 | 36 | 1230-1420 | 69%[5] | 40% | 24 | 71 | 15% |
| 47. Yeshiva University (NY) | 63 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 45 | 91% | 79% | 89% | +10 | 26 | 66% | 0.4% | 6/1 | 87 | 1080-1360 | 47% | 84% | 17 | 39 | 21% |
| 49. Northeastern University (MA) | 62 | 3.2 | 4.1 | 69 | 94% | 75% | 79% | +4 | 29 | 63% | 7% | 13/1 | 36 | 1280-1460 | 63%[5] | 32% | 90 | 112 | 12% |
| 49. University of California–Irvine* | 62 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 39 | 94% | 84% | 86% | +2 | 46 | 46% | 21% | 19/1 | 77 | 1010-1280 | 96% | 42% | 43 | 198 | 6% |
| 49. University of Florida* | 62 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 36 | 96% | 82% | 85% | +3 | 102 | 49% | 17% | 21/1 | 46 | 1170-1360 | 77% | 44% | 46 | 84 | 14% |

■ ■ ■

## What Is a National University?

■ ■ ■

To assess more than 1,500 of the country's four-year colleges and universities, U.S. News first assigns each to a group of its peers, based on the categories of higher education institutions developed in 2010 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The National Universities category consists of the 281 institutions (173 public, 101 private and seven for-profit) that offer a wide range of undergraduate majors as well as master's and doctoral degrees; some emphasize research. A list of the top 30 public national universities appears on Page 82.

Data on up to 16 indicators of academic quality are gathered from each institution and tabulated. Schools are ranked by their total weighted score; those receiving the same rank are tied and listed in alphabetical order. For a description of the methodology, see Page 72, and for more on a college, turn to the directory at the back of the book.

Note: Key to footnotes, Page 82.

# Best
# National Universities

| Rank School (State) (*Public) | Overall score | Peer assessment score (5.0=highest) | High school counselor assessment score | Graduation and retention rank | Average freshman retention rate | 2013 graduation rate Predicted | 2013 graduation rate Actual | Over-performance(+) Under-performance(-) | Faculty resources rank | % of classes under 20 ('13) | % of classes of 50 or more ('13) | Student/faculty ratio ('13) | Selectivity rank | SAT/ACT 25th-75th percentile ('13) | Freshmen in top 10% of HS class ('13) | Acceptance rate ('13) | Financial resources rank | Alumni giving rank | Average alumni giving rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Princeton University (NJ) | 100 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 2 | 98% | 94% | 97% | +3 | 5 | 71% | 11% | 6/1 | 5 | 1410-1600 | 95%[5] | 7% | 10 | 1 | 63% |
| 2. Harvard University (MA) | 99 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 2 | 97% | 95% | 97% | +2 | 3 | 76% | 10% | 7/1 | 5 | 1410-1600 | 95%[5] | 6% | 5 | 10 | 35% |
| 3. Yale University (CT) | 98 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 1 | 99% | 95% | 98% | +3 | 8 | 77% | 7% | 6/1 | 3 | 1420-1590 | 95%[5] | 7% | 1 | 7 | 36% |
| 4. Columbia University (NY) | 95 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 5 | 99% | 94% | 96% | +2 | 4 | 82% | 9% | 6/1 | 5 | 1400-1570 | 93%[5] | 7% | 11 | 13 | 34% |
| 4. Stanford University (CA) | 95 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 5 | 98% | 94% | 96% | +2 | 10 | 69% | 12% | 5/1 | 5 | 1380-1570 | 96%[5] | 6% | 8 | 7 | 36% |
| 4. University of Chicago | 95 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 10 | 99% | 93% | 93% | None | 1 | 76% | 5% | 6/1 | 3 | 1440-1590 | 98% | 9% | 6 | 4 | 40% |
| 7. Massachusetts Inst. of Technology | 93 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 15 | 98% | 95% | 93% | -2 | 12 | 69% | 12% | 8/1 | 1 | 1430-1570 | 99%[5] | 8% | 7 | 6 | 37% |
| 8. Duke University (NC) | 92 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 10 | 97% | 94% | 94% | None | 1 | 71% | 6% | 7/1 | 14 | 1360-1550 | 90%[5] | 12% | 14 | 10 | 35% |
| 8. University of Pennsylvania | 92 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 2 | 98% | 94% | 96% | +2 | 6 | 68% | 10% | 6/1 | 10 | 1360-1540 | 94%[5] | 12% | 11 | 15 | 34% |
| 10. California Institute of Technology | 91 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 22 | 97% | 95% | 93% | -2 | 11 | 63% | 10% | 3/1 | 1 | 1490-1600 | 99%[5] | 11% | 1 | 30 | 23% |
| 11. Dartmouth College (NH) | 90 | 4.2 | 4.8 | 5 | 98% | 93% | 95% | +2 | 15 | 62% | 9% | 8/1 | 10 | 1360-1560 | 90%[5] | 10% | 16 | 2 | 48% |
| 12. Johns Hopkins University (MD) | 89 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 18 | 97% | 93% | 93% | None | 18 | 72% | 10% | 10/1 | 18 | 1340-1520 | 84%[5] | 17% | 3 | 12 | 34% |
| 13. Northwestern University (IL) | 88 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 10 | 97% | 94% | 94% | None | 6 | 75% | 7% | 7/1 | 10 | 1390-1550 | 91%[5] | 14% | 11 | 24 | 26% |
| 14. Washington University in St. Louis | 86 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 10 | 97% | 95% | 94% | -1 | 12 | 65% | 12% | 8/1 | 5 | 32-34 | 95%[5] | 16% | 4 | 19 | 27% |
| 15. Cornell University (NY) | 85 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 15 | 97% | 92% | 93% | +1 | 20 | 56% | 18% | 9/1 | 20 | 1320-1520 | 87%[5] | 16% | 17 | 16 | 30% |
| 16. Brown University (RI) | 84 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 5 | 98% | 93% | 94% | +1 | 17 | 69% | 10% | 8/1 | 39 | 1330-1540[3] | 94%[5] | 9% | 24 | 5 | 38% |
| 16. University of Notre Dame (IN) | 84 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 5 | 98% | 92% | 95% | +3 | 16 | 60% | 9% | 10/1 | 15 | 32-34 | 90%[5] | 22% | 29 | 3 | 42% |
| 16. Vanderbilt University (TN) | 84 | 4.1 | 4.6 | 18 | 97% | 92% | 93% | +1 | 12 | 65% | 9% | 8/1 | 10 | 32-34 | 88%[5] | 13% | 15 | 27 | 26% |
| 19. Rice University (TX) | 82 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 18 | 97% | 92% | 91% | -1 | 9 | 68% | 10% | 6/1 | 15 | 1370-1550 | 87% | 17% | 23 | 17 | 29% |
| 20. University of California–Berkeley* | 79 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 22 | 97% | 87% | 91% | +4 | 32 | 60% | 16% | 17/1 | 20 | 1250-1500 | 98% | 18% | 38 | 98 | 13% |
| 21. Emory University (GA) | 77 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 29 | 95% | 92% | 91% | -1 | 24 | 59% | 8% | 8/1 | 29 | 1260-1470 | 76%[5] | 27% | 18 | 18 | 28% |
| 21. Georgetown University (DC) | 77 | 4.0 | 4.8 | 15 | 96% | 92% | 92% | None | 44 | 60% | 7% | 11/1 | 18 | 1320-1500 | 92%[5] | 17% | 29 | 19 | 26% |
| 23. Univ. of California–Los Angeles* | 76 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 22 | 97% | 86% | 90% | +4 | 32 | 50% | 22% | 17/1 | 25 | 1190-1450 | 97% | 20% | 20 | 104 | 12% |
| 23. University of Virginia* | 76 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 10 | 97% | 88% | 93% | +5 | 32 | 55% | 16% | 16/1 | 24 | 1250-1460 | 92%[5] | 30% | 59 | 32 | 22% |
| 25. Carnegie Mellon University (PA) | 75 | 4.2 | 4.7 | 32 | 95% | 91% | 88% | -3 | 20 | 67% | 11% | 13/1 | 22 | 1340-1530 | 80%[5] | 25% | 29 | 54 | 17% |
| 25. Univ. of Southern California | 75 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 27 | 97% | 91% | 91% | None | 38 | 57% | 13% | 9/1 | 22 | 1280-1480 | 88%[5] | 20% | 26 | 13 | 34% |
| 27. Tufts University (MA) | 73 | 3.6 | 4.5 | 18 | 97% | 92% | 92% | None | 31 | 68% | 8% | 9/1 | 15 | 1370-1520 | 91%[5] | 19% | 29 | 37 | 20% |
| 27. Wake Forest University (NC) | 73 | 3.5 | 4.4 | 33 | 94% | 89% | 86% | -3 | 28 | 57% | 1% | 11/1 | 32 | 1230-1420[2] | 76%[5] | 35% | 9 | 24 | 26% |
| 29. University of Michigan–Ann Arbor* | 72 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 22 | 97% | 89% | 90% | +1 | 68 | 47% | 18% | 15/1 | 39 | 28-32 | 65%[4] | 33% | 41 | 46 | 19% |
| 30. U. of North Carolina–Chapel Hill* | 71 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 29 | 97% | 87% | 90% | +3 | 68 | 39% | 13% | 13/1 | 32 | 1200-1410 | 78% | 27% | 34 | 42 | 20% |
| 31. Boston College | 69 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 22 | 95% | 90% | 91% | +1 | 53 | 51% | 7% | 13/1 | 25 | 1270-1450 | 81%[5] | 32% | 71 | 24 | 26% |
| 32. New York University | 68 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 40 | 92% | 89% | 84% | -5 | 20 | 62% | 9% | 10/1 | 45 | 1260-1460 | 63%[5] | 32% | 34 | 147 | 9% |
| 33. College of William and Mary (VA)* | 67 | 3.7 | 4.4 | 27 | 96% | 89% | 90% | +1 | 55 | 48% | 8% | 12/1 | 25 | 1270-1460 | 80%[5] | 33% | 110 | 29 | 24% |
| 33. University of Rochester (NY) | 67 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 37 | 96% | 90% | 85% | -5 | 23 | 70% | 13% | 10/1 | 30 | 1250-1450[2] | 75%[5] | 36% | 21 | 52 | 18% |
| 35. Brandeis University (MA) | 66 | 3.5 | 4.1 | 29 | 93% | 91% | 90% | -1 | 49 | 60% | 10% | 10/1 | 42 | 1230-1470 | 65%[5] | 37% | 52 | 19 | 27% |
| 35. Georgia Institute of Technology* | 66 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 50 | 95% | 87% | 82% | -5 | 110 | 39% | 25% | 18/1 | 28 | 1290-1480 | 81%[5] | 41% | 43 | 19 | 27% |
| 37. Univ. of California–San Diego* | 65 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 35 | 95% | 84% | 86% | +2 | 99 | 40% | 35% | 19/1 | 30 | 1180-1400 | 100% | 37% | 21 | 166 | 8% |
| 38. Case Western Reserve Univ. (OH) | 64 | 3.5 | 4.3 | 62 | 93% | 88% | 80% | -8 | 32 | 64% | 11% | 10/1 | 32 | 1270-1480 | 67%[5] | 42% | 26 | 42 | 20% |
| 38. University of California–Davis* | 64 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 48 | 93% | 80% | 84% | +4 | 55 | 40% | 23% | 17/1 | 50 | 1080-1340 | 100% | 41% | 28 | 156 | 8% |
| 40. Lehigh University (PA) | 63 | 3.3 | 4.1 | 33 | 94% | 91% | 86% | -5 | 41 | 48% | 11% | 10/1 | 43 | 1220-1410 | 60%[5] | 31% | 55 | 30 | 23% |
| 40. Univ. of California–Santa Barbara* | 63 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 50 | 92% | 81% | 86% | +5 | 28 | 49% | 18% | 17/1 | 39 | 1130-1370 | 100% | 40% | 69 | 60 | 16% |
| 42. Boston University | 62 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 40 | 92% | 84% | 84% | None | 32 | 62% | 12% | 13/1 | 50 | 1190-1390 | 58%[5] | 37% | 47 | 132 | 9% |
| 42. Northeastern University (MA) | 62 | 3.2 | 4.2 | 56 | 95% | 79% | 83% | +4 | 24 | 66% | 7% | 13/1 | 32 | 1300-1480 | 64%[5] | 32% | 82 | 104 | 12% |
| 42. Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst. (NY) | 62 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 45 | 93% | 89% | 85% | -4 | 41 | 51% | 13% | 15/1 | 36 | 1290-1488 | 72%[5] | 41% | 43 | 98 | 12% |
| 42. University of California–Irvine* | 62 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 37 | 94% | 82% | 86% | +4 | 38 | 50% | 20% | 19/1 | 64 | 1040-1290 | 96% | 41% | 46 | 196 | 6% |
| 42. U. of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign* | 62 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 40 | 94% | 83% | 84% | +1 | 55 | 42% | 20% | 18/1 | 50 | 26-31 | 55%[5] | 62% | 64 | 127 | 10% |
| 47. Univ. of Wisconsin–Madison* | 61 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 40 | 95% | 85% | 84% | -1 | 91 | 46% | 19% | 17/1 | 54 | 26-30 | 51% | 51% | 59 | 132 | 9% |
| 48. Pennsylvania State U.–Univ. Park* | 60 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 37 | 92% | 76% | 85% | +9 | 90 | 42% | 13% | 17/1 | 107 | 1070-1280 | 36%[5] | 55% | 52 | 65 | 15% |
| 48. University of Florida* | 60 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 35 | 96% | 83% | 87% | +4 | 99 | 47% | 16% | 21/1 | 45 | 1170-1360 | 77% | 47% | 47 | 72 | 15% |
| 48. University of Miami (FL) | 60 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 62 | 91% | 86% | 82% | -4 | 44 | 50% | 8% | 12/1 | 36 | 1230-1420 | 72%[5] | 40% | 25 | 65 | 15% |
| 48. University of Washington* | 60 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 56 | 93% | 80% | 82% | +2 | 144 | 34% | 22% | 11/1 | 54 | 1100-1360 | 92%[5] | 55% | 34 | 75 | 14% |
| 48. Yeshiva University (NY) | 60 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 40 | 91% | 83% | 89% | +6 | 24 | 64% | 1% | 6/1 | 88 | 1100-1370 | 45% | 82% | 18 | 48 | 18% |

More @ usnews.com/bestcolleges

**Note:** Key to footnotes, Page 80.

## What Is a National University?

To assess nearly 1,600 of the country's four-year colleges and universities, U.S. News first assigns each to a group of its peers, based on the categories of higher education institutions developed in 2010 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The National Universities category consists of the 280 institutions (173 public, 100 private and seven for-profit) that offer a wide range of undergraduate majors as well as master's and doctoral degrees; some emphasize research. A list of the top 30 public national universities appears on Page 80.

Data on up to 16 indicators of academic quality are gathered from each institution and tabulated. Schools are ranked by their total weighted score; those receiving the same rank are tied and listed in alphabetical order. For a description of the methodology, see Page 68, and for more on a college, turn to the directory at the back of the book.

# Best National Universities

| Rank | School (State) (*Public) | Overall score | Peer assessment score (5.0=highest) | High school counselor assessment score | Graduation and retention rank | Average freshman retention rate | 2014 graduation rate | | Over-performance(+) Under-performance(-) | Faculty resources rank | % of classes under 20 ('14) | % of classes of 50 or more ('14) | Student/ faculty ratio ('14) | Selectivity rank | SAT/ACT 25th-75th percentile ('14) | Freshmen in top 10% of HS class ('14) | Acceptance rate ('14) | Financial resources rank | Alumni giving rank | Average alumni giving rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Predicted | Actual | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Princeton University (NJ) | 100 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 3 | 98% | 96% | 97% | +1 | 5 | 72% | 11% | 6/1 | 4 | 1400-1600 | 96%[5] | 7% | 10 | 1 | 63% |
| 2. | Harvard University (MA) | 99 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 1 | 97% | 95% | 98% | +3 | 4 | 74% | 10% | 7/1 | 4 | 1410-1600 | 95%[5] | 6% | 4 | 11 | 35% |
| 3. | Yale University (CT) | 97 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 1 | 99% | 96% | 96% | None | 9 | 75% | 9% | 6/1 | 4 | 1410-1600 | 96%[5] | 6% | 1 | 13 | 34% |
| 4. | Columbia University (NY) | 95 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 5 | 99% | 94% | 96% | +2 | 3 | 82% | 9% | 6/1 | 8 | 1390-1570 | 93%[5] | 7% | 12 | 13 | 34% |
| 4. | Stanford University (CA) | 95 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 5 | 98% | 95% | 95% | None | 10 | 70% | 11% | 4/1 | 4 | 1380-1570 | 95%[5] | 5% | 7 | 9 | 36% |
| 4. | University of Chicago (IL) | 95 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 11 | 99% | 94% | 93% | -1 | 1 | 77% | 6% | 6/1 | 2 | 1430-1590 | 98% | 9% | 6 | 4 | 41% |
| 7. | Massachusetts Inst. of Technology | 93 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 16 | 98% | 96% | 91% | -5 | 15 | 67% | 14% | 8/1 | 2 | 1420-1570 | 97%[5] | 8% | 7 | 5 | 37% |
| 8. | Duke University (NC) | 92 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 10 | 97% | 95% | 95% | None | 1 | 73% | 6% | 7/1 | 13 | 1370-1550 | 91%[5] | 11% | 15 | 11 | 35% |
| 9. | University of Pennsylvania | 91 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 3 | 98% | 97% | 96% | -1 | 7 | 67% | 10% | 6/1 | 8 | 1360-1550 | 93%[5] | 10% | 12 | 13 | 33% |
| 10. | California Institute of Technology | 90 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 20 | 97% | 96% | 92% | -4 | 11 | 65% | 9% | 3/1 | 1 | 1500-1600 | 100%[5] | 9% | 2 | 33 | 22% |
| 10. | Johns Hopkins University (MD) | 90 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 16 | 97% | 93% | 94% | +1 | 18 | 72% | 10% | 10/1 | 16 | 1360-1530 | 88%[5] | 15% | 3 | 9 | 35% |
| 12. | Dartmouth College (NH) | 89 | 4.2 | 4.8 | 5 | 98% | 95% | 95% | None | 13 | 64% | 8% | 7/1 | 8 | 1360-1550 | 93%[5] | 12% | 15 | 2 | 46% |
| 12. | Northwestern University (IL) | 89 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 11 | 97% | 94% | 94% | None | 5 | 76% | 7% | 7/1 | 13 | 1390-1560 | 90%[5] | 13% | 9 | 20 | 26% |
| 14. | Brown University (RI) | 85 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 5 | 98% | 95% | 96% | +1 | 17 | 68% | 10% | 9/1 | 13 | 1330-1550 | 92%[5] | 9% | 24 | 6 | 36% |
| 15. | Cornell University (NY) | 84 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 16 | 97% | 94% | 93% | -1 | 20 | 55% | 18% | 9/1 | 20 | 1330-1510 | 87%[5] | 14% | 17 | 17 | 30% |
| 15. | Vanderbilt University (TN) | 84 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 16 | 97% | 93% | 93% | None | 12 | 66% | 9% | 8/1 | 8 | 32-34 | 91%[5] | 13% | 14 | 18 | 27% |
| 15. | Washington University in St. Louis | 84 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 11 | 97% | 97% | 95% | -2 | 13 | 66% | 11% | 8/1 | 8 | 32-34 | 92%[5] | 17% | 4 | 26 | 24% |
| 18. | Rice University (TX) | 82 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 20 | 97% | 93% | 93% | None | 8 | 68% | 8% | 6/1 | 16 | 1390-1550 | 88%[5] | 15% | 22 | 16 | 30% |
| 18. | University of Notre Dame (IN) | 82 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 5 | 98% | 94% | 96% | +2 | 16 | 58% | 10% | 10/1 | 16 | 32-34 | 90%[5] | 21% | 27 | 3 | 42% |
| 20. | University of California–Berkeley* | 77 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 23 | 97% | 92% | 91% | -1 | 33 | 59% | 15% | 17/1 | 20 | 1290-1490 | 98% | 16% | 39 | 84 | 13% |
| 21. | Emory University (GA) | 76 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 28 | 95% | 93% | 91% | -2 | 20 | 61% | 9% | 8/1 | 26 | 1280-1460 | 81%[5] | 27% | 17 | 26 | 24% |
| 21. | Georgetown University (DC) | 76 | 4.0 | 4.8 | 11 | 96% | 95% | 95% | None | 38 | 61% | 7% | 11/1 | 20 | 1320-1520 | 92%[5] | 17% | 32 | 18 | 27% |
| 23. | Carnegie Mellon University (PA) | 74 | 4.2 | 4.7 | 32 | 95% | 90% | 88% | -2 | 24 | 65% | 11% | 13/1 | 24 | 1340-1540 | 79%[5] | 25% | 32 | 54 | 17% |
| 23. | Univ. of California–Los Angeles* | 74 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 23 | 97% | 90% | 91% | +1 | 30 | 51% | 22% | 17/1 | 25 | 1190-1460 | 97% | 19% | 20 | 106 | 11% |
| 23. | Univ. of Southern California | 74 | 3.9 | 4.4 | 23 | 97% | 92% | 91% | -1 | 43 | 57% | 13% | 9/1 | 23 | 1280-1480 | 88%[4] | 18% | 25 | 6 | 36% |
| 26. | University of Virginia* | 73 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 11 | 97% | 92% | 94% | +2 | 35 | 55% | 15% | 15/1 | 26 | 1250-1460 | 89%[5] | 29% | 67 | 35 | 21% |
| 27. | Tufts University (MA) | 72 | 3.6 | 4.5 | 20 | 96% | 93% | 92% | -1 | 30 | 69% | 7% | 9/1 | 16 | 1360-1520 | 90%[5] | 17% | 27 | 37 | 20% |
| 27. | Wake Forest University (NC) | 72 | 3.5 | 4.4 | 34 | 94% | 87% | 88% | +1 | 35 | 55% | 1% | 11/1 | 36 | 1210-1420[2] | 77%[5] | 34% | 11 | 24 | 25% |
| 29. | University of Michigan–Ann Arbor* | 71 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 23 | 97% | 92% | 91% | -1 | 67 | 48% | 18% | 15/1 | 31 | 29-33 | 73%[5] | 32% | 41 | 43 | 19% |
| 30. | Boston College | 68 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 23 | 95% | 90% | 91% | +1 | 51 | 52% | 7% | 12/1 | 26 | 1270-1460 | 81%[5] | 34% | 69 | 20 | 26% |
| 30. | U. of North Carolina–Chapel Hill* | 68 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 28 | 97% | 88% | 90% | +2 | 86 | 39% | 15% | 13/1 | 36 | 1210-1400 | 78% | 29% | 32 | 50 | 18% |
| 32. | New York University | 67 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 40 | 92% | 87% | 82% | -5 | 19 | 61% | 8% | 10/1 | 49 | 1240-1450 | 54%[5] | 35% | 32 | 139 | 9% |
| 33. | University of Rochester (NY) | 66 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 38 | 96% | 88% | 84% | -4 | 20 | 69% | 12% | 10/1 | 34 | 1240-1450[2] | 72%[4] | 36% | 22 | 46 | 18% |
| 34. | Brandeis University (MA) | 65 | 3.5 | 4.1 | 31 | 94% | 91% | 91% | None | 48 | 62% | 10% | 10/1[4] | 36 | 1250-1480 | 71%[5] | 35% | 51 | 20 | 26% |
| 34. | College of William and Mary (VA)* | 65 | 3.7 | 4.4 | 28 | 96% | 90% | 90% | None | 54 | 48% | 9% | 12/1 | 31 | 1270-1470 | 81%[5] | 33% | 113 | 26 | 24% |
| 36. | Georgia Institute of Technology* | 64 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 49 | 96% | 86% | 82% | -4 | 116 | 39% | 25% | 19/1 | 26 | 1310-1490 | 79%[5] | 33% | 44 | 20 | 26% |
| 37. | Case Western Reserve Univ. (OH) | 63 | 3.5 | 4.3 | 65 | 93% | 85% | 81% | -4 | 46 | 62% | 13% | 11/1 | 34 | 1270-1470 | 68%[5] | 38% | 27 | 35 | 21% |
| 37. | Univ. of California–Santa Barbara* | 63 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 54 | 92% | 84% | 87% | +3 | 20 | 49% | 18% | 17/1 | 40 | 1120-1380 | 100% | 36% | 67 | 62 | 16% |
| 39. | University of California–Irvine* | 62 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 36 | 93% | 85% | 87% | +2 | 28 | 58% | 20% | 19/1 | 63 | 1040-1310 | 96% | 37% | 51 | 182 | 6% |
| 39. | Univ. of California–San Diego* | 62 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 36 | 95% | 89% | 86% | -3 | 111 | 38% | 36% | 19/1 | 30 | 1180-1420 | 100% | 33% | 21 | 167 | 7% |
| 41. | Boston University | 61 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 40 | 93% | 82% | 85% | +3 | 39 | 60% | 12% | 13/1 | 55 | 1190-1410 | 59%[5] | 35% | 47 | 127 | 9% |
| 41. | Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst. (NY) | 61 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 40 | 93% | 86% | 82% | -4 | 39 | 52% | 12% | 15/1 | 36 | 1300-1490 | 69%[5] | 38% | 47 | 93 | 13% |
| 41. | Tulane University (LA) | 61 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 74 | 90% | 85% | 83% | -2 | 25 | 65% | 6% | 9/1 | 45 | 29-32 | 56%[5] | 28% | 61 | 50 | 17% |
| 41. | University of California–Davis* | 61 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 47 | 93% | 84% | 87% | +3 | 82 | 35% | 27% | 18/1 | 55 | 1080-1350 | 100% | 41% | 32 | 156 | 8% |
| 41. | U. of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign* | 61 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 40 | 94% | 82% | 84% | +2 | 58 | 42% | 20% | 18/1 | 49 | 26-32 | 59%[5] | 59% | 56 | 119 | 10% |
| 41. | Univ. of Wisconsin–Madison* | 61 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 40 | 95% | 83% | 85% | +2 | 86 | 46% | 20% | 17/1 | 58 | 26-31 | 52% | 50% | 62 | 106 | 11% |
| 47. | Lehigh University (PA) | 60 | 3.2 | 4.1 | 32 | 95% | 93% | 87% | -6 | 39 | 49% | 11% | 10/1 | 46 | 1230-1410 | 62%[5] | 34% | 56 | 37 | 21% |
| 47. | Northeastern University (MA) | 60 | 3.2 | 4.2 | 54 | 96% | 80% | 82% | +2 | 28 | 64% | 8% | 14/1 | 31 | 1340-1500 | 66%[5] | 32% | 78 | 98 | 12% |
| 47. | Pennsylvania State U.–Univ. Park* | 60 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 38 | 92% | 71% | 86% | +15 | 102 | 38% | 15% | 16/1 | 93 | 1090-1290 | 40%[5] | 50% | 56 | 74 | 15% |
| 47. | University of Florida* | 60 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 34 | 96% | 84% | 88% | +4 | 82 | 49% | 16% | 21/1 | 49 | 1170-1360 | 75% | 47% | 45 | 56 | 16% |

**Note:** Key to footnotes, Page 80.

## What Is a National University?

To assess nearly 1,600 of the country's four-year colleges and universities, U.S. News first assigns each to a group of its peers, based on the categories of higher education institutions developed in 2010 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The National Universities category consists of the 280 institutions (173 public, 100 private and seven for-profit) that offer a wide range of undergraduate majors as well as master's and doctoral degrees; some emphasize research. A list of the top 30 public national universities appears on Page 80.

Data on up to 16 indicators of academic quality are gathered from each institution and tabulated. Schools are ranked by their total weighted score; those receiving the same rank are tied and listed in alphabetical order. For a description of the methodology, see Page 68, and for more on a college, turn to the directory at the back of the book.

# Best
# National Universities

Year 2016-2017

| Rank School (State) (*Public) | Overall score | Peer assessment score (5.0=highest) | High school counselor assessment score | Graduation and retention rank | Average first-year student retention rate | 2015 graduation rate | | | Faculty resources rank | % of classes under 20 ('15) | % of classes of 50 or more ('15) | Student/ faculty ratio ('15) | Selectivity rank | SAT/ACT 25th-75th percentile ('15) | Freshmen in top 10% of HS class ('15) | Acceptance rate ('15) | Financial resources rank | Alumni giving rank | Average alumni giving rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Predicted | Actual | Over-performance (+) Under-performance (-) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Princeton University (NJ) | 100 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 1 | 98% | 97% | 97% | None | 7 | 70% | 11% | 5/1 | 5 | 1390-1590 | 94%[5] | 7% | 10 | 1 | 63% |
| 2. Harvard University (MA) | 98 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 1 | 97% | 97% | 98% | +1 | 4 | 73% | 12% | 7/1 | 5 | 1400-1600 | 95%[5] | 6% | 6 | 8 | 35% |
| 3. University of Chicago | 97 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 11 | 99% | 94% | 92% | -2 | 1 | 78% | 6% | 5/1 | 1 | 1440-1600 | 98%[5] | 8% | 5 | 3 | 41% |
| 3. Yale University (CT) | 97 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 1 | 99% | 97% | 97% | None | 9 | 74% | 9% | 6/1 | 3 | 1430-1600 | 97%[5] | 7% | 1 | 15 | 32% |
| 5. Columbia University (NY) | 95 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 4 | 99% | 97% | 96% | -1 | 2 | 83% | 9% | 6/1 | 5 | 1400-1590 | 96%[5] | 6% | 13 | 13 | 33% |
| 5. Stanford University (CA) | 95 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 4 | 98% | 95% | 94% | -1 | 9 | 71% | 11% | 4/1 | 5 | 1390-1580 | 96%[5] | 5% | 6 | 9 | 35% |
| 7. Massachusetts Inst. of Technology | 94 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 15 | 98% | 97% | 92% | -5 | 14 | 64% | 13% | 3/1 | 3 | 1430-1580 | 98%[5] | 8% | 3 | 6 | 37% |
| 8. Duke University (NC) | 92 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 10 | 97% | 95% | 95% | None | 2 | 73% | 7% | 6/1 | 13 | 1360-1550 | 91%[5] | 12% | 16 | 9 | 35% |
| 8. University of Pennsylvania | 92 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 4 | 98% | 97% | 95% | -2 | 6 | 68% | 10% | 6/1 | 5 | 1380-1550 | 95%[5] | 10% | 11 | 9 | 35% |
| 10. Johns Hopkins University (MD) | 91 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 15 | 97% | 93% | 94% | +1 | 20 | 73% | 10% | 8/1 | 10 | 1400-1550 | 92%[5] | 13% | 4 | 6 | 37% |
| 11. Dartmouth College (NH) | 90 | 4.3 | 4.9 | 4 | 98% | 95% | 94% | -1 | 13 | 64% | 8% | 7/1 | 13 | 1330-1560 | 91%[5] | 11% | 15 | 2 | 45% |
| 12. California Institute of Technology | 89 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 20 | 97% | 98% | 91% | -7 | 11 | 62% | 10% | 3/1 | 1 | 1500-1600 | 99%[5] | 9% | 2 | 32 | 22% |
| 12. Northwestern University (IL) | 89 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 11 | 97% | 96% | 93% | -3 | 5 | 77% | 6% | 7/1 | 13 | 31-34 | 91%[5] | 13% | 9 | 19 | 27% |
| 14. Brown University (RI) | 87 | 4.4 | 4.9 | 4 | 98% | 95% | 96% | +1 | 17 | 70% | 11% | 7/1 | 10 | 1370-1590 | 91%[5] | 9% | 22 | 9 | 35% |
| 15. Cornell University (NY) | 85 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 15 | 97% | 93% | 93% | None | 22 | 57% | 17% | 9/1 | 20 | 1330-1530 | 89%[5] | 15% | 17 | 18 | 29% |
| 15. Rice University (TX) | 85 | 4.1 | 4.6 | 20 | 97% | 93% | 91% | -2 | 7 | 69% | 7% | 6/1 | 13 | 1390-1560 | 89%[5] | 16% | 21 | 15 | 32% |
| 15. University of Notre Dame (IN) | 85 | 4.0 | 4.7 | 4 | 98% | 95% | 97% | +2 | 15 | 60% | 9% | 10/1 | 18 | 32-34 | 91%[5] | 20% | 28 | 3 | 41% |
| 15. Vanderbilt University (TN) | 85 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 15 | 97% | 94% | 92% | -2 | 11 | 66% | 9% | 8/1 | 10 | 32-35 | 91%[5] | 12% | 13 | 20 | 26% |
| 19. Washington University in St. Louis | 84 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 11 | 96% | 97% | 93% | -4 | 15 | 63% | 11% | 8/1 | 13 | 32-34 | 89%[5] | 17% | 6 | 28 | 24% |
| 20. Emory University (GA) | 78 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 28 | 95% | 93% | 89% | -4 | 19 | 61% | 8% | 8/1 | 23 | 1270-1490 | 83%[5] | 24% | 17 | 32 | 22% |
| 20. Georgetown University (DC) | 78 | 4.0 | 4.8 | 15 | 96% | 95% | 94% | -1 | 34 | 60% | 7% | 11/1 | 22 | 1320-1500 | 89%[5] | 17% | 32 | 17 | 30% |
| 20. University of California–Berkeley* | 78 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 23 | 97% | 93% | 91% | -2 | 34 | 60% | 16% | 17/1 | 20 | 1250-1500 | 98% | 15% | 36 | 88 | 12% |
| 23. Univ. of Southern California | 77 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 23 | 97% | 92% | 92% | None | 39 | 61% | 12% | 9/1 | 32 | 1270-1500 | 88%[5] | 18% | 25 | 5 | 39% |
| 24. Carnegie Mellon University (PA) | 75 | 4.2 | 4.6 | 33 | 96% | 91% | 88% | -3 | 26 | 65% | 12% | 13/1 | 23 | 1360-1540 | 78%[5] | 24% | 32 | 54 | 16% |
| 24. Univ. of California–Los Angeles* | 75 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 23 | 96% | 90% | 91% | +1 | 32 | 51% | 22% | 17/1 | 23 | 1190-1470 | 97% | 17% | 20 | 152 | 8% |
| 24. University of Virginia* | 75 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 11 | 97% | 91% | 93% | +2 | 32 | 56% | 14% | 15/1 | 29 | 1250-1460 | 89%[5] | 30% | 55 | 35 | 20% |
| 27. Tufts University (MA) | 74 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 20 | 97% | 93% | 93% | None | 30 | 68% | 8% | 9/1 | 18 | 1370-1520 | 90%[4] | 16% | 28 | 41 | 20% |
| 27. University of Michigan–Ann Arbor* | 74 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 23 | 97% | 91% | 90% | -1 | 49 | 57% | 17% | 15/1 | 29 | 29-33 | 73%[5] | 26% | 40 | 46 | 19% |
| 27. Wake Forest University (NC) | 74 | 3.5 | 4.3 | 36 | 94% | 88% | 88% | None | 24 | 58% | 1% | 10/1 | 40 | 1200-1410[2] | 77%[5] | 29% | 11 | 24 | 25% |
| 30. U. of North Carolina–Chapel Hill* | 71 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 28 | 97% | 89% | 90% | +1 | 89 | 42% | 14% | 14/1 | 35 | 1200-1390 | 77% | 30% | 27 | 52 | 17% |
| 31. Boston College | 70 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 23 | 95% | 89% | 92% | +3 | 49 | 49% | 7% | 12/1 | 27 | 1260-1470 | 79%[4] | 29% | 66 | 22 | 25% |
| 32. College of William and Mary (VA)* | 68 | 3.7 | 4.3 | 28 | 96% | 89% | 90% | +1 | 45 | 49% | 9% | 12/1 | 32 | 1260-1460 | 81%[5] | 34% | 112 | 20 | 26% |
| 32. University of Rochester (NY) | 68 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 38 | 96% | 89% | 88% | -1 | 21 | 71% | 12% | 10/1 | 35 | 1240-1470[2] | 68%[5] | 34% | 22 | 42 | 19% |
| 34. Brandeis University (MA) | 67 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 32 | 93% | 90% | 87% | -3 | 49 | 61% | 11% | 10/1 | 35 | 1250-1470 | 71%[5] | 34% | 48 | 30 | 23% |
| 34. Georgia Institute of Technology* | 67 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 47 | 96% | 88% | 85% | -3 | 170 | 38% | 26% | 19/1 | 27 | 1310-1500 | 81%[5] | 32% | 48 | 22 | 26% |
| 36. New York University | 66 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 47 | 92% | 86% | 84% | -2 | 39 | 60% | 8% | 10/1 | 58 | 1250-1470 | 56%[5] | 33% | 32 | 136 | 9% |
| 37. Case Western Reserve Univ. (OH) | 65 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 60 | 93% | 87% | 81% | -6 | 57 | 59% | 13% | 11/1 | 32 | 30-33 | 71%[5] | 36% | 36 | 35 | 21% |
| 37. Univ. of California–Santa Barbara* | 65 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 68 | 92% | 86% | 86% | None | 18 | 49% | 19% | 18/1 | 35 | 1130-1370 | 100% | 33% | 66 | 54 | 16% |
| 39. Boston University | 64 | 3.5 | 4.3 | 44 | 93% | 81% | 85% | +4 | 41 | 58% | 14% | 12/1 | 49 | 1200-1410 | 58%[5] | 33% | 48 | 115 | 10% |
| 39. Northeastern University (MA) | 64 | 3.2 | 4.3 | 47 | 96% | 80% | 84% | +4 | 27 | 65% | 7% | 14/1 | 31 | 31-34 | 70%[5] | 28% | 81 | 94 | 12% |
| 39. Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst. (NY) | 64 | 3.5 | 4.4 | 47 | 94% | 85% | 81% | -4 | 41 | 54% | 12% | 15/1 | 35 | 1280-1490 | 72%[5] | 42% | 53 | 88 | 12% |
| 39. Tulane University (LA) | 64 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 72 | 91% | 84% | 83% | -1 | 22 | 65% | 5% | 8/1 | 42 | 29-32 | 55%[5] | 31% | 55 | 51 | 17% |
| 39. University of California–Irvine* | 64 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 38 | 93% | 85% | 88% | +3 | 27 | 58% | 21% | 19/1 | 68 | 1040-1310 | 96% | 39% | 55 | 187 | 6% |
| 44. Lehigh University (PA) | 63 | 3.2 | 4.1 | 33 | 95% | 91% | 88% | -3 | 41 | 47% | 12% | 10/1 | 47 | 1230-1420 | 60%[5] | 30% | 55 | 35 | 21% |
| 44. University of California–Davis* | 63 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 47 | 93% | 87% | 88% | +1 | 102 | 36% | 27% | 19/1 | 49 | 1070-1340 | 100% | 38% | 36 | 162 | 7% |
| 44. Univ. of California–San Diego* | 63 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 36 | 95% | 89% | 87% | -2 | 170 | 35% | 38% | 19/1 | 23 | 1210-1450 | 100% | 34% | 22 | 202 | 6% |
| 44. U. of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign* | 63 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 44 | 94% | 82% | 85% | +3 | 72 | 41% | 20% | 18/1 | 58 | 26-31 | 53%[5] | 66% | 55 | 115 | 10% |
| 44. University of Miami (FL) | 63 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 58 | 92% | 84% | 82% | -2 | 38 | 54% | 7% | 12/1 | 42 | 28-32 | 63%[4] | 38% | 26 | 62 | 15% |
| 44. Univ. of Wisconsin–Madison* | 63 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 40 | 95% | 81% | 85% | +4 | 118 | 45% | 21% | 17/1 | 54 | 27-31 | 54%[5] | 49% | 63 | 79 | 13% |
| 50. Pennsylvania State U.–Univ. Park* | 62 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 40 | 93% | 73% | 86% | +13 | 108 | 39% | 15% | 16/1 | 98 | 1090-1300 | 41%[5] | 51% | 55 | 68 | 14% |
| 50. Pepperdine University (CA) | 62 | 3.3 | 4.4 | 55 | 93% | 77% | 84% | +7 | 34 | 69% | 2% | 13/1 | 74 | 1100-1320 | 48%[4] | 38% | 66 | 175 | 7% |
| 50. University of Florida* | 62 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 33 | 96% | 85% | 87% | +2 | 89 | 49% | 16% | 21/1 | 54 | 1170-1350 | 72% | 48% | 46 | 68 | 14% |
| 50. Villanova University (PA)† | 62 | 3.2 | 4.2 | 31 | 95% | 83% | 90% | +7 | 108 | 43% | 4% | 12/1 | 54 | 1200-1400 | 55%[5] | 48% | 103 | 24 | 25% |

Note: Key to footnotes, Page 79.

## What Is a National University?

• • • • •

To assess more than 1,600 of the country's four-year colleges and universities, U.S. News first assigns each to a group of its peers, based on the categories of higher education institutions developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and recently revised. The National Universities category consists of 310 institutions (189 public, 114 private and seven for-profit) that offer a wide range of undergraduate majors as well as master's and doctoral degrees; some emphasize research. A list of the top 30 public national universities appears on Page 79.

Data on up to 15 indicators of academic quality are gathered from each institution and tabulated. Schools are ranked by total weighted score; those tied at the same rank are listed alphabetically. For a description of the methodology, see Page 68. For more on a college, turn to the directory at the back of the book.

# Best National Universities

Year 2017-2018

| Rank School (State) (*Public) | Overall score | Peer assessment score (5.0=highest) | High school counselor assessment score | Graduation and retention rank | Average first-year student retention rate | 2016 graduation rate Predicted | 2016 graduation rate Actual | Over-performance (+) Under-performance (-) | Faculty resources rank | % of classes under 20 ('16) | % of classes of 50 or more ('16) | Student/ faculty ratio ('16) | Selectivity rank | SAT/ACT 25th-75th percentile** ('16) | Freshmen in top 10% of HS class ('16) | Acceptance rate ('16) | Financial resources rank | Alumni giving rank | Average alumni giving rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Princeton University (NJ) | 100 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 2 | 98% | 96% | 97% | +1 | 6 | 73% | 11% | 5/1 | 6 | 1400-1590 | 94%[5] | 7% | 10 | 1 | 61% |
| 2. Harvard University (MA) | 98 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 2 | 97% | 95% | 97% | +2 | 4 | 74% | 10% | 7/1 | 3 | 1430-1600 | 95%[5] | 5% | 8 | 9 | 35% |
| 3. University of Chicago | 96 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 11 | 99% | 95% | 94% | -1 | 3 | 77% | 6% | 5/1 | 1 | 1450-1600 | 98% | 8% | 4 | 3 | 41% |
| 3. Yale University (CT) | 96 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 1 | 99% | 96% | 98% | +2 | 9 | 75% | 8% | 6/1 | 6 | 1420-1600 | 94%[5] | 6% | 1 | 17 | 30% |
| 5. Columbia University (NY) | 95 | 4.7 | 4.9 | 4 | 99% | 95% | 96% | +1 | 2 | 83% | 9% | 6/1 | 3 | 1430-1600 | 95%[5] | 6% | 12 | 14 | 32% |
| 5. Massachusetts Inst. of Technology | 95 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 14 | 98% | 95% | 93% | -2 | 12 | 70% | 13% | 3/1 | 3 | 1460-1590 | 97%[5] | 8% | 3 | 8 | 36% |
| 5. Stanford University (CA) | 95 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 9 | 98% | 94% | 94% | None | 11 | 70% | 12% | 4/1 | 6 | 1380-1580 | 95%[5] | 5% | 4 | 11 | 34% |
| 8. University of Pennsylvania | 93 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 4 | 98% | 95% | 95% | None | 6 | 70% | 10% | 6/1 | 6 | 1380-1570 | 95%[5] | 9% | 12 | 7 | 36% |
| 9. Duke University (NC) | 92 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 9 | 97% | 95% | 95% | None | 1 | 71% | 7% | 6/1 | 15 | 1380-1570 | 91%[5] | 11% | 15 | 9 | 34% |
| 10. California Institute of Technology | 91 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 14 | 97% | 95% | 94% | -1 | 9 | 67% | 9% | 3/1 | 1 | 1510-1600 | 97%[5] | 8% | 2 | 22 | 25% |
| 11. Dartmouth College (NH) | 90 | 4.3 | 4.9 | 4 | 98% | 95% | 97% | +2 | 14 | 62% | 8% | 7/1 | 11 | 1350-1560 | 93%[5] | 11% | 15 | 2 | 45% |
| 11. Johns Hopkins University (MD) | 90 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 14 | 97% | 95% | 94% | -1 | 19 | 74% | 10% | 7/1 | 6 | 1420-1570 | 94%[5] | 12% | 6 | 6 | 37% |
| 11. Northwestern University (IL) | 90 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 11 | 98% | 95% | 94% | -1 | 5 | 77% | 6% | 7/1 | 11 | 32-34 | 91%[5] | 11% | 9 | 18 | 28% |
| 14. Brown University (RI) | 86 | 4.4 | 4.9 | 4 | 98% | 95% | 96% | +1 | 18 | 68% | 11% | 7/1 | 11 | 1370-1570 | 92%[5] | 9% | 22 | 13 | 32% |
| 14. Cornell University (NY) | 86 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 14 | 97% | 94% | 94% | None | 24 | 58% | 18% | 9/1 | 19 | 1330-1530 | 90%[5] | 14% | 17 | 20 | 27% |
| 14. Rice University (TX) | 86 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 21 | 97% | 93% | 93% | None | 8 | 71% | 8% | 6/1 | 15 | 1410-1570 | 88%[5] | 15% | 20 | 11 | 34% |
| 14. Vanderbilt University (TN) | 86 | 4.2 | 4.7 | 14 | 97% | 94% | 92% | -2 | 13 | 66% | 9% | 8/1 | 11 | 32-35 | 87%[5] | 11% | 12 | 22 | 25% |
| 18. University of Notre Dame (IN) | 85 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 4 | 98% | 94% | 95% | +1 | 15 | 60% | 10% | 10/1 | 15 | 32-35 | 91%[5] | 19% | 27 | 3 | 41% |
| 18. Washington University in St. Louis | 85 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 11 | 96% | 96% | 94% | -2 | 15 | 65% | 11% | 8/1 | 15 | 32-34 | 86%[5] | 17% | 6 | 26 | 24% |
| 20. Georgetown University (DC) | 80 | 4.1 | 4.8 | 14 | 96% | 95% | 94% | -1 | 31 | 61% | 7% | 11/1 | 21 | 1320-1520 | 91%[5] | 17% | 37 | 15 | 31% |
| 21. Emory University (GA) | 78 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 30 | 94% | 93% | 91% | -2 | 19 | 61% | 13% | 9/1 | 23 | 1290-1500 | 83%[5] | 25% | 18 | 33 | 21% |
| 21. University of California–Berkeley* | 78 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 21 | 97% | 91% | 92% | +1 | 44 | 52% | 17% | 18/1 | 19 | 1300-1530 | 98% | 16% | 37 | 79 | 12% |
| 21. Univ. of California–Los Angeles* | 78 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 24 | 97% | 90% | 91% | +1 | 22 | 57% | 18% | 17/1 | 26 | 1160-1460 | 97% | 18% | 19 | 140 | 8% |
| 21. Univ. of Southern California | 78 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 24 | 96% | 93% | 92% | -1 | 41 | 59% | 12% | 8/1 | 29 | 1280-1500 | 88%[5] | 17% | 22 | 3 | 41% |
| 25. Carnegie Mellon University (PA) | 76 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 32 | 96% | 89% | 90% | +1 | 29 | 67% | 12% | 13/1 | 23 | 1380-1550 | 75%[5] | 22% | 37 | 56 | 15% |
| 25. University of Virginia* | 76 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 14 | 97% | 94% | 94% | None | 33 | 56% | 15% | 15/1 | 23 | 1240-1460 | 89%[5] | 30% | 55 | 33 | 21% |
| 27. Wake Forest University (NC) | 75 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 36 | 94% | 92% | 88% | -4 | 24 | 59% | 1% | 10/1 | 33 | 28-32[2] | 78%[5] | 30% | 11 | 25 | 24% |
| 28. University of Michigan–Ann Arbor* | 74 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 24 | 97% | 94% | 91% | -3 | 50 | 60% | 17% | 15/1 | 37 | 29-33 | 74%[5] | 29% | 42 | 47 | 18% |
| 29. Tufts University (MA) | 72 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 21 | 96% | 94% | 92% | -2 | 33 | 68% | 7% | 8/1 | 57 | 31-34 | N/A | 14% | 32 | 36 | 20% |
| 30. New York University | 71 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 49 | 93% | 85% | 85% | None | 24 | 60% | 9% | 10/1 | 39 | 1250-1480[2] | 61%[5] | 32% | 32 | 110 | 10% |
| 30. U. of North Carolina–Chapel Hill* | 71 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 28 | 97% | 89% | 91% | +2 | 94 | 39% | 14% | 13/1 | 39 | 27-32 | 73% | 27% | 27 | 51 | 16% |
| 32. Boston College | 70 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 24 | 95% | 92% | 93% | +1 | 59 | 49% | 7% | 12/1 | 28 | 1260-1460 | 80%[5] | 31% | 66 | 22 | 25% |
| 32. College of William & Mary (VA)* | 70 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 28 | 96% | 91% | 91% | None | 44 | 49% | 7% | 12/1 | 33 | 1250-1470 | 78%[5] | 37% | 111 | 18 | 28% |
| 34. Brandeis University (MA) | 68 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 32 | 93% | 91% | 90% | -1 | 44 | 62% | 10% | 10/1 | 32 | 1270-1480[2] | 72%[5] | 33% | 49 | 33 | 21% |
| 34. Georgia Institute of Technology* | 68 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 41 | 97% | 90% | 86% | -4 | 178 | 38% | 26% | 20/1 | 22 | 1320-1500 | 87%[5] | 26% | 55 | 26 | 24% |
| 34. University of Rochester (NY) | 68 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 38 | 96% | 90% | 85% | -5 | 23 | 71% | 12% | 10/1 | 47 | 1250-1460[2] | 68%[5] | 38% | 20 | 32 | 21% |
| 37. Boston University | 67 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 41 | 93% | 83% | 87% | +4 | 37 | 61% | 13% | 10/1 | 45 | 1220-1420 | 63%[5] | 29% | 52 | 110 | 10% |
| 37. Case Western Reserve Univ. (OH) | 67 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 60 | 93% | 85% | 82% | -3 | 55 | 59% | 13% | 11/1 | 29 | 30-34 | 71%[5] | 35% | 41 | 41 | 19% |
| 37. Univ. of California–Santa Barbara* | 67 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 56 | 93% | 87% | 88% | +1 | 17 | 49% | 20% | 17/1 | 33 | 1140-1390 | 100% | 36% | 69 | 54 | 16% |
| 40. Northeastern University (MA) | 66 | 3.3 | 4.2 | 41 | 97% | 80% | 86% | +6 | 27 | 67% | 6% | 14/1 | 26 | 31-34 | 76%[5] | 29% | 81 | 92 | 11% |
| 40. Tulane University (LA) | 66 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 66 | 92% | 85% | 83% | -2 | 27 | 62% | 6% | 8/1 | 37 | 29-33 | 61%[5] | 26% | 46 | 51 | 17% |
| 42. Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst. (NY) | 65 | 3.5 | 4.4 | 56 | 93% | 84% | 83% | -1 | 41 | 53% | 13% | 13/1 | 39 | 1280-1480 | 66%[5] | 44% | 65 | 92 | 11% |
| 42. University of California–Irvine* | 65 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 38 | 92% | 85% | 87% | +2 | 29 | 57% | 21% | 18/1 | 60 | 1060-1330 | 98% | 41% | 55 | 198 | 5% |
| 42. Univ. of California–San Diego* | 65 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 36 | 95% | 87% | 87% | None | 150 | 36% | 36% | 19/1 | 29 | 1140-1420 | 100% | 36% | 22 | 198 | 5% |
| 42. University of Florida* | 65 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 34 | 96% | 83% | 87% | +4 | 89 | 48% | 15% | 20/1 | 47 | 1180-1370 | 73% | 46% | 49 | 86 | 12% |
| 46. Lehigh University (PA) | 64 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 34 | 95% | 93% | 89% | -4 | 41 | 50% | 11% | 9/1 | 43 | 1230-1420 | 64%[5] | 26% | 55 | 36 | 20% |
| 46. Pepperdine University (CA) | 64 | 3.3 | 4.3 | 49 | 92% | 76% | 87% | +11 | 37 | 69% | 2% | 14/1 | 79 | 1110-1330 | 49%[5] | 37% | 66 | 152 | 8% |
| 46. University of California–Davis* | 64 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 49 | 93% | 86% | 85% | -1 | 106 | 38% | 27% | 20/1 | 57 | 1050-1330 | 100%[5] | 42% | 32 | 162 | 7% |
| 46. University of Miami (FL) | 64 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 60 | 92% | 86% | 82% | -4 | 36 | 54% | 7% | 12/1 | 47 | 28-32 | 60%[5] | 38% | 26 | 67 | 14% |
| 46. Univ. of Wisconsin–Madison* | 64 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 41 | 95% | 83% | 85% | +2 | 124 | 44% | 21% | 18/1 | 52 | 27-31 | 54%[5] | 53% | 61 | 67 | 13% |
| 46. Villanova University (PA) | 64 | 3.2 | 4.1 | 30 | 95% | 84% | 90% | +6 | 101 | 42% | 3% | 12/1 | 45 | 30-32 | 62%[5] | 44% | 103 | 21 | 26% |

## What Is a National University?

••••

To assess more than 1,600 of the country's four-year colleges and universities, U.S. News first assigns each to a group of its peers, based on the categories of higher education institutions developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and recently revised. The National Universities category consists of 311 institutions (190 public, 114 private and seven for-profit) that offer a wide range of undergraduate majors as well as master's and doctoral degrees; some emphasize research. A list of the top 30 public national universities appears on Page 78.

Data on up to 15 indicators of academic quality are gathered from each institution and tabulated. Schools are ranked by total weighted score; those tied at the same rank are listed alphabetically. For a description of the methodology, see Page 66. For more on a college, turn to the directory at the back of the book.

**Note:** Key to footnotes, Page 78.

# Best National Universities

Year 2018-2019

| Rank School (State) (*Public) | Overall score | Peer assessment score (5.0=highest) | High school counselor assessment score | Graduation and retention rank | Average first-year student retention rate | 2017 graduation rate | | | Faculty resources rank | % of classes under 20 ('17) | % of classes of 50 or more ('17) | Student/faculty ratio ('17) | Selectivity rank | SAT/ACT 25th-75th percentile** ('17) | Freshmen in top 10% of HS class ('17) | Acceptance rate ('17) | Financial resources rank | Alumni giving rank | Average alumni giving rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Predicted | Actual | Over-performance (+)/Under-performance (-) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Princeton University (NJ) | 100 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 5 | 98% | 96% | 97% | +1 | 4 | 76% | 10% | 5/1 | 10 | 1430-1570 | 91%[5] | 6% | 10 | 1 | 59% |
| 2. Harvard University (MA) | 96 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 3 | 97% | 96% | 96% | None | 6 | 73% | 11% | 6/1 | 5 | 1460-1590 | 95%[5] | 5% | 7 | 9 | 33% |
| 3. Columbia University (NY) | 94 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 3 | 99% | 94% | 96% | +2 | 2 | 82% | 9% | 6/1 | 5 | 32-35 | 96%[5] | 6% | 13 | 15 | 30% |
| 3. Massachusetts Institute of Technology | 94 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 21 | 99% | 93% | 94% | +1 | 11 | 70% | 11% | 3/1 | 1 | 1490-1570 | 98%[5] | 7% | 1 | 8 | 34% |
| 3. University of Chicago | 94 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 26 | 99% | 95% | 93% | -2 | 2 | 80% | 6% | 5/1 | 1 | 32-35 | 99% | 9% | 7 | 5 | 40% |
| 3. Yale University (CT) | 94 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 7 | 99% | 96% | 97% | +1 | 9 | 73% | 9% | 6/1 | 5 | 1420-1590 | 94%[5] | 7% | 1 | 18 | 28% |
| 7. Stanford University (CA) | 93 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 13 | 98% | 94% | 94% | None | 12 | 68% | 12% | 4/1 | 10 | 1390-1540 | 94%[5] | 5% | 5 | 12 | 32% |
| 8. Duke University (NC) | 92 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 13 | 97% | 94% | 95% | +1 | 1 | 71% | 7% | 6/1 | 16 | 31-35 | 90%[5] | 10% | 15 | 9 | 33% |
| 8. University of Pennsylvania | 92 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 7 | 98% | 96% | 96% | None | 7 | 68% | 11% | 6/1 | 5 | 32-35 | 96%[5] | 9% | 14 | 7 | 37% |
| 10. Johns Hopkins University (MD) | 90 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 21 | 97% | 94% | 94% | None | 17 | 74% | 10% | 7/1 | 3 | 33-35 | 94%[5] | 12% | 4 | 6 | 38% |
| 10. Northwestern University (IL) | 90 | 4.4 | 4.7 | 19 | 98% | 95% | 94% | -1 | 5 | 79% | 6% | 6/1 | 10 | 32-35 | 91%[5] | 9% | 9 | 16 | 30% |
| 12. California Institute of Technology | 88 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 37 | 98% | 95% | 89% | -6 | 10 | 67% | 10% | 3/1 | 3 | 1530-1590 | 93% | 8% | 1 | 22 | 26% |
| 12. Dartmouth College (NH) | 88 | 4.3 | 4.8 | 13 | 98% | 95% | 96% | +1 | 14 | 65% | 7% | 7/1 | 10 | 1430-1560 | 93%[5] | 10% | 16 | 2 | 44% |
| 14. Brown University (RI) | 85 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 7 | 98% | 94% | 95% | +1 | 17 | 70% | 11% | 7/1 | 5 | 31-35 | 94%[5] | 9% | 24 | 13 | 32% |
| 14. Vanderbilt University (TN) | 85 | 4.2 | 4.7 | 26 | 97% | 94% | 92% | -2 | 13 | 66% | 8% | 7/1 | 10 | 32-35 | 90%[5] | 11% | 12 | 24 | 25% |
| 16. Cornell University (NY) | 84 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 13 | 97% | 93% | 93% | None | 23 | 57% | 18% | 9/1 | 19 | 1390-1550 | 86%[5] | 13% | 17 | 21 | 26% |
| 16. Rice University (TX) | 84 | 4.1 | 4.6 | 26 | 97% | 93% | 91% | -2 | 7 | 70% | 9% | 6/1 | 10 | 33-35 | 89%[5] | 16% | 20 | 11 | 33% |
| 18. University of Notre Dame (IN) | 83 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 19 | 98% | 95% | 95% | None | 16 | 62% | 10% | 10/1 | 16 | 32-34 | 91%[5] | 19% | 25 | 3 | 41% |
| 19. University of California–Los Angeles* | 82 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 1 | 97% | 87% | 91% | +4 | 21 | 57% | 19% | 18/1 | 27 | 1240-1500 | 97% | 16% | 19 | 122 | 8% |
| 19. Washington University in St. Louis | 82 | 4.1 | 4.6 | 37 | 97% | 97% | 94% | -3 | 15 | 64% | 11% | 8/1 | 16 | 32-34 | 87%[5] | 16% | 6 | 24 | 24% |
| 21. Emory University (GA) | 79 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 34 | 94% | 90% | 91% | +1 | 20 | 63% | 12% | 9/1 | 24 | 30-33 | 83%[5] | 22% | 17 | 32 | 21% |
| 22. Georgetown University (DC) | 78 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 13 | 96% | 95% | 95% | None | 33 | 62% | 6% | 11/1 | 19 | 1350-1520 | 90%[5] | 16% | 32 | 13 | 31% |
| 22. University of California–Berkeley* | 78 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 7 | 97% | 90% | 91% | +1 | 47 | 54% | 19% | 18/1 | 19 | 1300-1530 | 98% | 17% | 36 | 87 | 12% |
| 22. University of Southern California | 78 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 13 | 96% | 93% | 92% | -1 | 39 | 60% | 12% | 8/1 | 34 | 30-34 | 88%[5] | 16% | 20 | 3 | 42% |
| 25. Carnegie Mellon University (PA) | 74 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 37 | 97% | 90% | 89% | -1 | 29 | 65% | 13% | 13/1 | 24 | 1430-1560 | 74%[5] | 22% | 36 | 57 | 15% |
| 25. University of Virginia* | 74 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 26 | 97% | 94% | 95% | +1 | 33 | 54% | 15% | 14/1 | 26 | 1310-1500 | 89%[5] | 27% | 50 | 34 | 20% |
| 27. Tufts University (MA) | 72 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 31 | 97% | 95% | 93% | -2 | 29 | 70% | 7% | 9/1 | 19 | 31-34 | 80%[5] | 15% | 30 | 31 | 21% |
| 27. University of Michigan–Ann Arbor* | 72 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 31 | 97% | 94% | 92% | -2 | 58 | 57% | 18% | 15/1 | 39 | 30-33 | 77%[5] | 27% | 40 | 47 | 17% |
| 27. Wake Forest University (NC) | 72 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 55 | 94% | 94% | 88% | -6 | 25 | 57% | 1% | 11/1 | 39 | 28-32[2] | 77%[5] | 28% | 10 | 24 | 24% |
| 30. New York University | 71 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 42 | 93% | 85% | 84% | -1 | 23 | 59% | 10% | 9/1 | 32 | 1290-1490[2] | 72%[5] | 28% | 32 | 87 | 11% |
| 30. University of California–Santa Barbara* | 71 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 21 | 93% | 84% | 86% | +2 | 17 | 49% | 20% | 17/1 | 27 | 1240-1470 | 100% | 33% | 70 | 50 | 16% |
| 30. U. of North Carolina–Chapel Hill* | 71 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 21 | 97% | 89% | 91% | +2 | 87 | 38% | 13% | 13/1 | 34 | 27-32 | 78% | 24% | 30 | 47 | 17% |
| 33. University of California–Irvine* | 70 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 2 | 93% | 81% | 85% | +4 | 29 | 55% | 22% | 18/1 | 53 | 1170-1410 | 98% | 37% | 56 | 168 | 6% |
| 33. University of Rochester (NY) | 70 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 34 | 97% | 88% | 85% | -3 | 22 | 71% | 11% | 10/1 | 46 | 1300-1490[2] | 66%[5] | 34% | 20 | 27 | 23% |
| 35. Brandeis University (MA) | 69 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 21 | 93% | 85% | 90% | +5 | 47 | 60% | 9% | 10/1 | 39 | 29-33 | 65%[5] | 34% | 47 | 35 | 19% |
| 35. Georgia Institute of Technology* | 69 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 37 | 97% | 89% | 85% | -4 | 117 | 39% | 26% | 22/1 | 19 | 1370-1520 | 88%[5] | 23% | 61 | 32 | 21% |
| 35. University of Florida* | 69 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 7 | 96% | 82% | 88% | +6 | 65 | 48% | 16% | 19/1 | 39 | 1240-1400 | 77% | 42% | 44 | 75 | 13% |
| 38. Boston College | 68 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 34 | 95% | 93% | 92% | -1 | 52 | 49% | 7% | 12/1 | 27 | 1320-1490 | 78%[5] | 32% | 63 | 23 | 25% |
| 38. College of William & Mary (VA)* | 68 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 42 | 95% | 93% | 92% | -1 | 47 | 49% | 7% | 11/1 | 31 | 1300-1480 | 81%[5] | 36% | 109 | 17 | 29% |
| 38. University of California–Davis* | 68 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 12 | 93% | 82% | 85% | +3 | 102 | 38% | 28% | 20/1 | 57 | 1120-1360 | 100%[5] | 44% | 28 | 154 | 7% |
| 41. University of California–San Diego* | 67 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 5 | 95% | 82% | 84% | +2 | 144 | 39% | 35% | 19/1 | 46 | 1140-1380 | 100% | 34% | 23 | 209 | 4% |
| 42. Boston University | 66 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 60 | 93% | 83% | 87% | +4 | 33 | 61% | 13% | 10/1 | 45 | 1300-1480[2] | 62%[5] | 25% | 53 | 105 | 10% |
| 42. Case Western Reserve Univ. (OH) | 66 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 66 | 93% | 83% | 83% | None | 52 | 60% | 13% | 11/1 | 32 | 30-33 | 70%[5] | 33% | 36 | 39 | 19% |
| 44. Northeastern University (MA) | 65 | 3.4 | 4.3 | 50 | 97% | 85% | 87% | +2 | 25 | 68% | 6% | 14/1 | 27 | 32-34 | 75%[5] | 27% | 79 | 87 | 11% |
| 44. Tulane University (LA) | 65 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 74 | 92% | 85% | 83% | -2 | 27 | 61% | 6% | 8/1 | 34 | 30-33 | 62%[5] | 21% | 42 | 50 | 16% |
| 46. Pepperdine University (CA) | 64 | 3.3 | 4.2 | 37 | 92% | 76% | 85% | +9 | 33 | 71% | 2% | 13/1 | 73 | 1200-1390 | 49%[5] | 40% | 65 | 122 | 9% |
| 46. University of Georgia* | 64 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 42 | 95% | 76% | 85% | +9 | 47 | 46% | 11% | 17/1 | 66 | 26-31 | 54% | 54% | 123 | 62 | 14% |
| 46. University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign* | 64 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 50 | 93% | 80% | 85% | +5 | 79 | 41% | 19% | 20/1 | 57 | 26-32 | 50%[5] | 62% | 56 | 147 | 7% |
| 49. Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst. (NY) | 63 | 3.5 | 4.3 | 62 | 93% | 84% | 83% | -1 | 39 | 52% | 12% | 13/1 | 39 | 1320-1500 | 63%[5] | 43% | 65 | 96 | 11% |
| 49. University of Texas–Austin* | 63 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 50 | 95% | 83% | 83% | None | 144 | 35% | 26% | 18/1 | 46 | 1230-1460 | 74% | 36% | 77 | 96 | 11% |
| 49. Univ. of Wisconsin–Madison* | 63 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 55 | 95% | 84% | 87% | +3 | 131 | 43% | 22% | 18/1 | 57 | 27-31 | 52%[5] | 54% | 61 | 75 | 13% |
| 49. Villanova University (PA) | 63 | 3.2 | 4.2 | 31 | 95% | 87% | 90% | +3 | 95 | 42% | 2% | 11/1 | 38 | 30-33 | 65%[5] | 36% | 109 | 19 | 27% |

## What Is a National University?

• • • •

**To assess more** than 1,600 of the country's four-year colleges and universities, U.S. News first assigns each to a group of its peers, based on the categories of higher education institutions developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The National Universities category consists of 312 institutions (191 public, 114 private and seven for-profit) that offer a wide range of undergraduate majors as well as master's and doctoral degrees; some institutions emphasize research. A list of the top 30 public national universities appears on Page 83.

Data on up to 16 indicators of academic quality are gathered from each institution and tabulated. Schools are ranked by total weighted score; those tied at the same rank are listed alphabetically. For a description of the methodology, see Page 72. For more on a college, turn to the directory at the back of the book.

**Note:** Key to footnotes, Page 83

# Best
# National Universities

Year 2019-2020

| Rank School (State) (*Public) | Overall score | Peer assessment score (5.0=highest) | Graduation and retention rank | Average first-year student retention rate | 2018 graduation rate Predicted | 2018 graduation rate Actual | Over-performance (+) Under-performance (-) | Pell recipient grad rate | Social mobility rank | Faculty resources rank | % of classes under 20 ('18) | % of classes of 50 or more ('18) | Student/ faculty ratio ('18) | Selectivity rank | SAT/ACT 25th-75th percentile ('18) | Freshmen in top 10% of HS class ('18) | Acceptance rate ('18) | Financial resources rank | Average alumni giving rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Princeton University (NJ) | 100 | 4.9 | 2 | 98% | 95% | 96% | +1 | 93% | 186 | 7 | 74% | 10% | 5/1 | 11 | 1440-1570 | 91%[4] | 5% | 12 | 59% |
| 2. Harvard University (MA) | 96 | 4.9 | 2 | 97% | 97% | 98% | +1 | 97% | 186 | 6 | 72% | 10% | 6/1 | 2 | 1460-1580 | 94% | 5% | 8 | 31% |
| 3. Columbia University (NY) | 94 | 4.7 | 4 | 99% | 94% | 96% | +2 | 93% | 138 | 3 | 82% | 9% | 6/1 | 2 | 1450-1560 | 96% | 6% | 13 | 30% |
| 3. Massachusetts Institute of Technology | 94 | 4.9 | 10 | 99% | 95% | 94% | -1 | 92% | 241 | 9 | 71% | 12% | 3/1 | 2 | 1500-1570 | 97% | 7% | 2 | 33% |
| 3. Yale University (CT) | 94 | 4.8 | 1 | 99% | 97% | 97% | None | 94% | 285 | 11 | 73% | 9% | 6/1 | 2 | 1450-1560 | 95% | 6% | 1 | 27% |
| 6. Stanford University (CA) | 93 | 4.9 | 10 | 98% | 94% | 94% | None | 93% | 241 | 13 | 69% | 11% | 5/1 | 7 | 1420-1570 | 96% | 4% | 5 | 30% |
| 6. University of Chicago | 93 | 4.6 | 10 | 99% | 98% | 94% | -4 | 89% | 335 | 1 | 79% | 6% | 5/1 | 1 | 33-35[2] | 99% | 7% | 7 | 40% |
| 6. University of Pennsylvania | 93 | 4.6 | 4 | 98% | 98% | 95% | -3 | 92% | 241 | 5 | 71% | 8% | 6/1 | 7 | 1440-1560 | 96% | 8% | 14 | 38% |
| 9. Northwestern University (IL) | 92 | 4.5 | 10 | 98% | 97% | 95% | -2 | 94% | 251 | 3 | 78% | 5% | 6/1 | 11 | 33-35 | 92% | 8% | 9 | 31% |
| 10. Duke University (NC) | 91 | 4.5 | 8 | 98% | 98% | 96% | -2 | 95% | 254 | 1 | 71% | 7% | 6/1 | 7 | 33-35 | 95% | 9% | 15 | 32% |
| 10. Johns Hopkins University (MD) | 91 | 4.7 | 18 | 97% | 97% | 94% | -3 | 94% | 241 | 18 | 74% | 9% | 7/1 | 2 | 33-35 | 96% | 11% | 3 | 37% |
| 12. California Institute of Technology | 89 | 4.7 | 19 | 98% | 98% | 92% | -6 | 96% | 345 | 9 | 68% | 9% | 3/1 | 18 | 1530-1580 | 96%[5] | 7% | 3 | 27% |
| 12. Dartmouth College (NH) | 89 | 4.4 | 8 | 97% | 97% | 95% | -2 | 92% | 303 | 8 | 62% | 7% | 7/1 | 11 | 1420-1560 | 95% | 9% | 16 | 43% |
| 14. Brown University (RI) | 86 | 4.5 | 4 | 98% | 96% | 95% | -1 | 91% | 224 | 16 | 70% | 10% | 6/1 | 7 | 1420-1550 | 96% | 8% | 26 | 31% |
| 15. University of Notre Dame (IN) | 84 | 4.2 | 4 | 98% | 98% | 97% | -1 | 95% | 322 | 14 | 62% | 10% | 10/1 | 11 | 33-35 | 89% | 18% | 27 | 42% |
| 15. Vanderbilt University (TN) | 84 | 4.3 | 19 | 97% | 98% | 94% | -4 | 90% | 291 | 16 | 66% | 7% | 7/1 | 11 | 33-35 | 89% | 10% | 11 | 26% |
| 17. Cornell University (NY) | 83 | 4.6 | 10 | 97% | 97% | 95% | -2 | 92% | 224 | 26 | 57% | 17% | 9/1 | 18 | 1390-1540 | 83% | 11% | 18 | 26% |
| 17. Rice University (TX) | 83 | 4.2 | 19 | 97% | 97% | 95% | -2 | 92% | 204 | 11 | 72% | 8% | 6/1 | 11 | 33-35 | 87% | 11% | 23 | 30% |
| 19. Washington University in St. Louis | 81 | 4.1 | 10 | 97% | 98% | 95% | -3 | 91% | 381 | 14 | 64% | 12% | 7/1 | 28 | 32-35 | 80%[5] | 15% | 5 | 24% |
| 20. University of California–Los Angeles* | 80 | 4.3 | 27 | 97% | 87% | 90% | +3 | 88% | 13 | 27 | 51% | 22% | 18/1 | 23 | 1270-1520 | 97% | 14% | 20 | 7% |
| 21. Emory University (GA) | 79 | 4.1 | 30 | 94% | 91% | 90% | -1 | 88% | 200 | 20 | 60% | 13% | 9/1 | 23 | 1350-1520 | 84% | 19% | 16 | 21% |
| 22. University of California–Berkeley* | 78 | 4.7 | 23 | 97% | 88% | 91% | +3 | 89% | 70 | 44 | 53% | 19% | 20/1 | 18 | 1300-1530 | 98% | 15% | 45 | 8% |
| 22. University of Southern California | 78 | 3.9 | 23 | 96% | 92% | 92% | None | 91% | 147 | 39 | 59% | 13% | 9/1 | 30 | 1350-1530 | 90%[5] | 13% | 22 | 41% |
| 24. Georgetown University (DC) | 77 | 4.2 | 10 | 96% | 98% | 94% | -4 | 94% | 241 | 39 | 61% | 6% | 11/1 | 18 | 1370-1530 | 89% | 15% | 33 | 31% |
| 25. Carnegie Mellon University (PA) | 75 | 4.3 | 30 | 97% | 94% | 89% | -5 | 82% | 303 | 22 | 66% | 12% | 13/1 | 17 | 1450-1560 | 87% | 17% | 38 | 14% |
| 25. University of Michigan–Ann Arbor* | 75 | 4.5 | 23 | 97% | 90% | 92% | +2 | 85% | 291 | 48 | 57% | 18% | 15/1 | 40 | 1330-1510 | 79%[5] | 23% | 40 | 17% |
| 27. Wake Forest University (NC) | 74 | 3.6 | 33 | 94% | 96% | 89% | -7 | 85% | 360 | 21 | 57% | 1% | 10/1 | 33 | 29-33[2] | 76% | 29% | 10 | 24% |
| 28. University of Virginia* | 73 | 4.2 | 10 | 97% | 98% | 94% | -4 | 91% | 328 | 39 | 55% | 15% | 15/1 | 23 | 1330-1500 | 90% | 26% | 47 | 20% |
| 29. Georgia Institute of Technology* | 72 | 4.3 | 40 | 97% | 89% | 87% | -2 | 81% | 224 | 42 | 45% | 14% | 21/1 | 18 | 1390-1540 | 89% | 23% | 58 | 19% |
| 29. New York University | 72 | 4.0 | 52 | 93% | 84% | 85% | +1 | 84% | 115 | 24 | 61% | 9% | 9/1 | 40 | 1310-1510[2] | 71% | 20% | 28 | 11% |
| 29. Tufts University (MA) | 72 | 3.8 | 19 | 97% | 98% | 93% | -5 | 91% | 328 | 27 | 69% | 7% | 9/1 | 23 | 31-34 | 78% | 15% | 31 | 22% |
| 29. U. of North Carolina–Chapel Hill* | 72 | 4.1 | 27 | 97% | 90% | 90% | None | 86% | 165 | 85 | 38% | 12% | 13/1 | 44 | 27-33 | 78% | 22% | 33 | 19% |
| 29. University of Rochester (NY) | 72 | 3.5 | 40 | 96% | 90% | 86% | -4 | 81% | 159 | 19 | 74% | 9% | 10/1 | 33 | 1320-1500[2] | 75% | 29% | 23 | 23% |
| 34. University of California–Santa Barbara* | 71 | 3.6 | 58 | 93% | 84% | 87% | +3 | 84% | 9 | 22 | 50% | 18% | 17/1 | 33 | 1230-1480 | 100% | 32% | 72 | 17% |
| 34. University of Florida* | 71 | 3.8 | 33 | 97% | 82% | 90% | +8 | 87% | 34 | 77 | 50% | 14% | 18/1 | 47 | 1280-1440 | 77% | 39% | 47 | 14% |
| 36. University of California–Irvine* | 70 | 3.8 | 46 | 93% | 78% | 83% | +5 | 81% | 3 | 58 | 53% | 23% | 18/1 | 51 | 1180-1440 | 99% | 29% | 61 | 7% |
| 37. Boston College | 69 | 3.7 | 23 | 95% | 95% | 92% | -3 | 91% | 270 | 42 | 49% | 6% | 11/1 | 28 | 1320-1490 | 78% | 28% | 65 | 24% |
| 37. University of California–San Diego* | 69 | 3.9 | 40 | 95% | 85% | 86% | +1 | 84% | 21 | 147 | 43% | 32% | 19/1 | 30 | 1250-1470 | 100% | 30% | 23 | 4% |
| 39. University of California–Davis* | 68 | 3.9 | 48 | 93% | 84% | 86% | +2 | 84% | 9 | 136 | 36% | 29% | 20/1 | 51 | 1150-1410 | 100% | 41% | 31 | 7% |
| 40. Boston University | 67 | 3.7 | 40 | 93% | 85% | 88% | +3 | 88% | 270 | 30 | 62% | 12% | 10/1 | 40 | 1330-1500[2] | 65% | 22% | 49 | 10% |
| 40. Brandeis University (MA) | 67 | 3.6 | 36 | 93% | 87% | 88% | +1 | 84% | 138 | 48 | 57% | 11% | 10/1 | 48 | 1280-1500 | 56% | 31% | 49 | 19% |
| 40. Case Western Reserve Univ. (OH) | 67 | 3.7 | 58 | 93% | 91% | 85% | -6 | 82% | 214 | 34 | 59% | 13% | 11/1 | 30 | 30-34 | 70% | 29% | 40 | 19% |
| 40. College of William & Mary (VA)* | 67 | 3.8 | 27 | 95% | 95% | 91% | -4 | 88% | 354 | 54 | 47% | 6% | 12/1 | 33 | 1310-1490 | 77% | 37% | 110 | 30% |
| 40. Northeastern University (MA) | 67 | 3.5 | 36 | 97% | 86% | 88% | +2 | 88% | 254 | 24 | 67% | 6% | 14/1 | 27 | 32-34 | 77% | 19% | 72 | 11% |
| 40. Tulane University (LA) | 67 | 3.6 | 58 | 93% | 81% | 85% | +4 | 77% | 365 | 27 | 62% | 6% | 8/1 | 33 | 30-33 | 63% | 17% | 33 | 17% |
| 46. Univ. of Wisconsin–Madison* | 65 | 4.1 | 40 | 95% | 84% | 87% | +3 | 84% | 297 | 147 | 45% | 22% | 17/1 | 59 | 27-32 | 54% | 52% | 61 | 12% |
| 46. Villanova University (PA) | 65 | 3.4 | 30 | 96% | 85% | 91% | +6 | 94% | 214 | 110 | 42% | 2% | 11/1 | 40 | 1300-1470 | 72% | 29% | 110 | 29% |
| 48. University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign* | 64 | 3.9 | 48 | 93% | 79% | 84% | +5 | 81% | 186 | 110 | 38% | 20% | 20/1 | 70 | 26-32 | 48% | 62% | 58 | 7% |
| 48. University of Texas–Austin* | 64 | 4.1 | 58 | 95% | 84% | 83% | -1 | 73% | 134 | 182 | 38% | 26% | 19/1 | 33 | 1230-1480 | 85% | 39% | 76 | 10% |
| 50. Lehigh University (PA) | 63 | 3.3 | 36 | 95% | 87% | 87% | None | 84% | 270 | 44 | 50% | 12% | 9/1 | 51 | 1270-1450 | 58% | 22% | 55 | 17% |
| 50. Pepperdine University (CA) | 63 | 3.4 | 52 | 91% | 80% | 83% | +3 | 84% | 96 | 36 | 70% | 3% | 14/1 | 65 | 1220-1420 | 57% | 36% | 65 | 9% |
| 50. Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst. (NY) | 63 | 3.5 | 58 | 93% | 88% | 86% | -2 | 80% | 270 | 34 | 52% | 10% | 13/1 | 44 | 1330-1500 | 64% | 43% | 69 | 10% |
| 50. University of Georgia* | 63 | 3.6 | 46 | 95% | 78% | 86% | +8 | 80% | 159 | 69 | 45% | 11% | 17/1 | 62 | 1240-1410 | 60% | 49% | 123 | 13% |

## What Is a National University?

**TO ASSESS MORE** than 1,600 of the country's four-year colleges and universities, U.S. News first assigns each to a group of its peers, based on the categories of higher education institutions developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The National Universities category consists of 399 institutions (211 public, 180 private and 8 for-profit) that offer a wide range of undergraduate majors as well as master's and doctoral degrees or professional practice doctorates; some institutions emphasize research. A list of the top 30 public national universities appears on Page 75.

Data on 15 indicators of academic quality are gathered from each institution. Schools are ranked by total weighted score; those tied are listed alphabetically. For a description of the methodology, see Page 60. For more on a college, turn to the directory at the back of the book.

Note: Key to footnotes, Page 75

# Best
# National Universities

Year 2020-2021

| Rank School (State) (*Public) | Overall score | Peer assessment score (5.0=highest) | Graduation and retention rank | Average first-year student retention rate | 2019 graduation rate Predicted | 2019 graduation rate Actual | Over-performance (+) Under-performance (-) | Pell recipient grad rate | Social mobility rank | Faculty resources rank | % of classes under 20 ('19) | % of classes of 50 or more ('19) | Student/ faculty ratio ('19) | Selectivity rank | SAT/ACT 25th-75th percentile ('19) | Freshmen in top 10% of HS class ('19) | Acceptance rate ('19) | Financial resources rank | Average alumni giving rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Princeton University (NJ) | 100 | 4.9 | 2 | 98% | 93% | 98% | +5 | 98% | 203 | 5 | 75% | 9% | 5/1 | 12 | 1460-1570 | 91% | 6% | 12 | 55% |
| 2. Harvard University (MA) | 98 | 4.9 | 2 | 97% | 94% | 97% | +3 | 95% | 224 | 5 | 74% | 11% | 6/1 | 5 | 1460-1570 | 93% | 5% | 7 | 30% |
| 3. Columbia University (NY) | 97 | 4.7 | 4 | 99% | 93% | 96% | +3 | 94% | 119 | 2 | 82% | 9% | 6/1 | 5 | 1450-1570 | 96% | 5% | 10 | 31% |
| 4. Massachusetts Institute of Technology | 96 | 4.9 | 10 | 99% | 94% | 95% | +1 | 91% | 209 | 11 | 71% | 11% | 3/1 | 3 | 1510-1570 | 95% | 7% | 2 | 32% |
| 4. Yale University (CT) | 96 | 4.8 | 1 | 99% | 96% | 97% | +1 | 95% | 291 | 8 | 73% | 9% | 6/1 | 5 | 1460-1570 | 92% | 6% | 1 | 26% |
| 6. Stanford University (CA) | 95 | 4.9 | 10 | 99% | 95% | 94% | -1 | 91% | 251 | 12 | 69% | 11% | 5/1 | 5 | 1440-1570 | 98% | 4% | 5 | 27% |
| 6. University of Chicago | 95 | 4.6 | 10 | 99% | 98% | 95% | -3 | 94% | 334 | 1 | 79% | 6% | 5/1 | 1 | 1500-1570[2] | 99% | 6% | 9 | 39% |
| 8. University of Pennsylvania | 94 | 4.6 | 4 | 98% | 96% | 96% | None | 92% | 265 | 3 | 71% | 9% | 6/1 | 5 | 1450-1560 | 94% | 8% | 14 | 38% |
| 9. California Institute of Technology | 93 | 4.6 | 21 | 98% | 97% | 94% | -3 | 100% | 340 | 8 | 69% | 8% | 3/1 | 1 | 1530-1560 | 99% | 6% | 3 | 27% |
| 9. Johns Hopkins University (MD) | 93 | 4.7 | 18 | 98% | 93% | 94% | +1 | 92% | 251 | 15 | 77% | 9% | 6/1 | 3 | 1470-1570 | 98% | 10% | 3 | 35% |
| 9. Northwestern University (IL) | 93 | 4.5 | 10 | 98% | 94% | 94% | None | 91% | 243 | 5 | 77% | 5% | 6/1 | 12 | 1440-1550 | 92% | 9% | 7 | 31% |
| 12. Duke University (NC) | 92 | 4.5 | 4 | 98% | 95% | 95% | None | 90% | 291 | 4 | 70% | 7% | 6/1 | 5 | 33-35 | 95% | 8% | 15 | 32% |
| 13. Dartmouth College (NH) | 91 | 4.4 | 4 | 97% | 95% | 95% | None | 93% | 284 | 8 | 64% | 7% | 7/1 | 12 | 1440-1560 | 95% | 8% | 16 | 44% |
| 14. Brown University (RI) | 88 | 4.5 | 4 | 98% | 95% | 96% | +1 | 92% | 203 | 17 | 69% | 11% | 6/1 | 16 | 1440-1570 | 91% | 7% | 24 | 30% |
| 14. Vanderbilt University (TN) | 88 | 4.3 | 18 | 97% | 94% | 93% | -1 | 90% | 291 | 16 | 61% | 8% | 7/1 | 12 | 33-35 | 90% | 9% | 12 | 29% |
| 16. Rice University (TX) | 87 | 4.2 | 18 | 97% | 92% | 93% | +1 | 89% | 224 | 13 | 69% | 8% | 6/1 | 5 | 1470-1570 | 93% | 9% | 23 | 30% |
| 16. Washington University in St. Louis | 87 | 4.2 | 10 | 97% | 98% | 95% | -3 | 95% | 381 | 13 | 66% | 10% | 7/1 | 19 | 33-35[2] | 84% | 14% | 6 | 24% |
| 18. Cornell University (NY) | 86 | 4.6 | 10 | 97% | 93% | 95% | +2 | 92% | 251 | 26 | 56% | 18% | 9/1 | 23 | 1400-1560 | 83% | 11% | 18 | 24% |
| 19. University of Notre Dame (IN) | 85 | 4.2 | 4 | 98% | 96% | 96% | None | 92% | 334 | 19 | 62% | 9% | 9/1 | 16 | 32-35 | 90% | 16% | 25 | 42% |
| 20. University of California–Los Angeles* | 84 | 4.3 | 26 | 97% | 83% | 91% | +8 | 89% | 13 | 32 | 50% | 22% | 18/1 | 26 | 1280-1530 | 97% | 12% | 20 | 7% |
| 21. Emory University (GA) | 83 | 4.1 | 28 | 94% | 89% | 90% | +1 | 91% | 135 | 20 | 62% | 13% | 9/1 | 23 | 1360-1530 | 84% | 16% | 16 | 20% |
| 22. University of California–Berkeley* | 82 | 4.7 | 21 | 97% | 87% | 93% | +6 | 88% | 76 | 64 | 53% | 19% | 19/1 | 19 | 1310-1530 | 97% | 17% | 48 | 8% |
| 23. Georgetown University (DC) | 81 | 4.2 | 10 | 96% | 96% | 95% | -1 | 90% | 284 | 31 | 60% | 6% | 11/1 | 19 | 1380-1550 | 85% | 14% | 33 | 29% |
| 24. University of Michigan–Ann Arbor* | 80 | 4.5 | 21 | 97% | 84% | 93% | +9 | 88% | 303 | 42 | 55% | 18% | 15/1 | 41 | 1340-1530[2] | 78%[5] | 23% | 41 | 17% |
| 24. University of Southern California | 80 | 3.9 | 26 | 96% | 89% | 91% | +2 | 90% | 161 | 42 | 61% | 12% | 8/1 | 32 | 1360-1530 | 90%[4] | 11% | 22 | 39% |
| 26. Carnegie Mellon University (PA) | 79 | 4.3 | 28 | 97% | 92% | 90% | -2 | 91% | 303 | 20 | 66% | 12% | 7/1 | 16 | 1460-1560 | 88% | 15% | 33 | 15% |
| 26. University of Virginia* | 79 | 4.3 | 10 | 97% | 94% | 95% | +1 | 93% | 318 | 38 | 53% | 15% | 14/1 | 23 | 1340-1520 | 90% | 24% | 44 | 19% |
| 28. U. of North Carolina–Chapel Hill* | 78 | 4.2 | 28 | 97% | 87% | 91% | +4 | 89% | 135 | 84 | 41% | 13% | 14/1 | 32 | 27-33 | 78% | 23% | 33 | 18% |
| 28. Wake Forest University (NC) | 78 | 3.6 | 35 | 95% | 95% | 88% | -7 | 86% | 357 | 20 | 60% | 2% | 10/1 | 32 | 30-33[2] | 75% | 30% | 10 | 23% |
| 30. New York University | 77 | 4.0 | 47 | 94% | 83% | 85% | +2 | 80% | 135 | 25 | 60% | 10% | 9/1 | 28 | 1350-1530[2] | 79% | 16% | 28 | 11% |
| 30. Tufts University (MA) | 77 | 3.8 | 21 | 96% | 96% | 94% | -2 | 95% | 318 | 32 | 68% | 8% | 9/1 | 26 | 1390-1540 | 80% | 15% | 31 | 22% |
| 30. University of California–Santa Barbara* | 77 | 3.6 | 62 | 93% | 80% | 88% | +8 | 84% | 13 | 23 | 51% | 19% | 17/1 | 28 | 1240-1490 | 100% | 30% | 64 | 17% |
| 30. University of Florida* | 77 | 3.8 | 34 | 97% | 81% | 88% | +7 | 86% | 48 | 56 | 53% | 10% | 17/1 | 32 | 1310-1470 | 81% | 37% | 46 | 16% |
| 34. University of Rochester (NY) | 76 | 3.5 | 43 | 96% | 88% | 87% | -1 | 86% | 209 | 17 | 77% | 8% | 10/1 | 79 | 1310-1500[9] | 69% | 30% | 21 | 22% |
| 35. Boston College | 75 | 3.8 | 21 | 95% | 92% | 94% | +2 | 96% | 259 | 42 | 49% | 6% | 11/1 | 41 | 1340-1500 | 82%[5] | 27% | 64 | 23% |
| 35. Georgia Institute of Technology* | 75 | 4.3 | 35 | 97% | 89% | 90% | +1 | 84% | 259 | 84 | 44% | 22% | 19/1 | 19 | 1370-1530 | 90% | 21% | 59 | 17% |
| 35. University of California–Irvine* | 75 | 3.8 | 52 | 93% | 81% | 84% | +3 | 84% | 2 | 64 | 52% | 23% | 18/1 | 46 | 1160-1440 | 99% | 27% | 68 | 7% |
| 35. University of California–San Diego* | 75 | 3.9 | 43 | 94% | 82% | 87% | +5 | 85% | 33 | 93 | 47% | 27% | 19/1 | 30 | 1230-1490 | 100% | 32% | 25 | 4% |
| 39. University of California–Davis* | 74 | 3.9 | 47 | 93% | 80% | 87% | +7 | 83% | 15 | 166 | 36% | 30% | 20/1 | 45 | 1150-1420 | 100% | 39% | 33 | 7% |
| 39. William & Mary (VA)* | 74 | 3.9 | 28 | 95% | 93% | 90% | -3 | 92% | 340 | 42 | 53% | 6% | 11/1 | 32 | 1320-1510 | 75% | 38% | 108 | 28% |
| 41. Tulane University (LA) | 73 | 3.6 | 52 | 93% | 86% | 86% | None | 80% | 377 | 24 | 66% | 6% | 8/1 | 32 | 31-33 | 64% | 13% | 27 | 18% |
| 42. Boston University | 72 | 3.7 | 41 | 94% | 84% | 88% | +4 | 90% | 237 | 26 | 62% | 12% | 10/1 | 51 | 1340-1510[2] | 64%[5] | 19% | 48 | 10% |
| 42. Brandeis University (MA) | 72 | 3.7 | 35 | 93% | 87% | 87% | None | 83% | 191 | 53 | 58% | 11% | 10/1 | 46 | 1350-1520[2] | 56% | 30% | 48 | 19% |
| 42. Case Western Reserve Univ. (OH) | 72 | 3.7 | 62 | 93% | 83% | 84% | +1 | 82% | 203 | 48 | 50% | 14% | 11/1 | 32 | 1340-1510 | 70% | 27% | 37 | 18% |
| 42. University of Texas at Austin* | 72 | 4.2 | 52 | 95% | 82% | 86% | +4 | 79% | 135 | 116 | 37% | 24% | 18/1 | 32 | 1230-1480 | 87% | 32% | 76 | 9% |
| 42. Univ. of Wisconsin–Madison* | 72 | 4.1 | 41 | 95% | 80% | 88% | +8 | 79% | 340 | 123 | 44% | 22% | 17/1 | 54 | 27-32 | 57% | 54% | 59 | 13% |
| 47. University of Georgia* | 71 | 3.7 | 43 | 96% | 77% | 87% | +10 | 81% | 191 | 67 | 48% | 11% | 17/1 | 54 | 1240-1420 | 60% | 46% | 119 | 13% |
| 47. University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign* | 71 | 3.9 | 52 | 93% | 77% | 85% | +8 | 80% | 161 | 104 | 38% | 21% | 20/1 | 59 | 1220-1480 | 55% | 59% | 64 | 6% |
| 49. Lehigh University (PA) | 70 | 3.4 | 35 | 95% | 84% | 90% | +6 | 83% | 278 | 38 | 51% | 10% | 9/1 | 51 | 1280-1450 | 58% | 32% | 52 | 15% |
| 49. Northeastern University (MA) | 70 | 3.5 | 35 | 97% | 84% | 89% | +5 | 87% | 278 | 36 | 68% | 6% | 14/1 | 41 | 1390-1540 | 75%[5] | 18% | 72 | 12% |
| 49. Pepperdine University (CA) | 70 | 3.5 | 52 | 91% | 78% | 86% | +8 | 89% | 113 | 38 | 69% | 2% | 13/1 | 72 | 1230-1450 | 46% | 32% | 56 | 9% |
| 49. University of Miami (FL) | 70 | 3.5 | 64 | 92% | 86% | 83% | -3 | 80% | 251 | 56 | 51% | 9% | 12/1 | 54 | 1270-1440 | 59% | 27% | 28 | 10% |

## What Is a National University?

**TO ASSESS MORE** than 1,800 of the country's four-year colleges and universities, U.S. News first assigns each to a group of its peers, based on the categories of higher education institutions developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The National Universities category consists of 389 institutions (209 public, 176 private and 4 for-profit) that offer a wide range of undergraduate majors as well as master's and doctoral degrees or professional practice doctorates; some institutions emphasize research. A list of the top 30 public national universities appears on Page 71.

Data on 17 indicators of academic quality are gathered from each institution. Schools are ranked by total weighted score; those tied are listed alphabetically. For a description of the methodology, see Page 58. For more on a college, turn to the directory at the back of the book.

# Best National Universities

Year 2021-2022

| Rank School (State) (*Public) | Overall score | Peer assessment score (5.0=highest) | Graduation and retention rank | Average first-year student retention rate | 2020 graduation rate Predicted | 2020 graduation rate Actual | Over-performance (+) / Under-performance (-) | Pell recipient grad rate | Social mobility rank | Faculty resources rank | % of classes under 20 ('20) | % of classes of 50 or more ('20) | Student/faculty ratio ('20) | Selectivity rank | SAT/ACT 25th-75th percentile ('20) | Freshmen in top 10% of HS class ('20) | Acceptance rate ('20) | Financial resources rank | Average alumni giving rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Princeton University (NJ) | 100 | 4.8 | 1 | 94% | 93% | 98% | +5 | 98% | 192 | 3 | 78% | 9% | 4/1 | 15 | 1450-1570 | 89% | 6% | 13 | 50% |
| 2. Columbia University (NY) | 97 | 4.7 | 1 | 98% | 93% | 97% | +4 | 95% | 192 | 2 | 83% | 9% | 6/1 | 5 | 1470-1570 | 96% | 6% | 9 | 28% |
| 2. Harvard University (MA) | 97 | 4.9 | 4 | 92% | 94% | 98% | +4 | 97% | 211 | 6 | 76% | 10% | 5/1 | 8 | 1460-1580 | 94% | 5% | 7 | 27% |
| 2. Massachusetts Institute of Technology | 97 | 4.9 | 4 | 99% | 93% | 96% | +3 | 94% | 179 | 11 | 70% | 11% | 3/1 | 1 | 1510-1580 | 100% | 7% | 2 | 29% |
| 5. Yale University (CT) | 96 | 4.8 | 11 | 91% | 96% | 96% | None | 94% | 265 | 6 | 77% | 8% | 4/1 | 8 | 1460-1580[2] | 94% | 7% | 1 | 24% |
| 6. Stanford University (CA) | 95 | 4.9 | 17 | 96% | 93% | 95% | +2 | 95% | 249 | 12 | 69% | 12% | 5/1 | 8 | 1420-1570[2] | 96% | 5% | 5 | 23% |
| 6. University of Chicago | 95 | 4.6 | 4 | 99% | 97% | 96% | -1 | 94% | 327 | 1 | 79% | 6% | 5/1 | 1 | 1500-1570[2] | 99% | 7% | 9 | 32% |
| 8. University of Pennsylvania | 94 | 4.6 | 4 | 97% | 96% | 96% | None | 92% | 275 | 6 | 70% | 9% | 6/1 | 5 | 1460-1570[2] | 96% | 9% | 14 | 38% |
| 9. California Institute of Technology | 93 | 4.6 | 22 | 97% | 97% | 92% | -5 | 92% | 265 | 10 | 67% | 9% | 3/1 | 3 | 1530-1580[2] | 96% | 7% | 3 | 25% |
| 9. Duke University (NC) | 93 | 4.5 | 4 | 97% | 96% | 95% | -1 | 94% | 312 | 3 | 75% | 7% | 6/1 | 5 | 34-35 | 95% | 8% | 15 | 30% |
| 9. Johns Hopkins University (MD) | 93 | 4.7 | 17 | 98% | 96% | 94% | -2 | 93% | 297 | 15 | 74% | 9% | 6/1 | 3 | 1480-1570[2] | 99% | 9% | 4 | 30% |
| 9. Northwestern University (IL) | 93 | 4.4 | 11 | 98% | 95% | 95% | None | 93% | 256 | 5 | 78% | 6% | 6/1 | 8 | 1430-1550[2] | 95% | 9% | 7 | 29% |
| 13. Dartmouth College (NH) | 91 | 4.4 | 4 | 97% | 96% | 95% | -1 | 91% | 265 | 9 | 63% | 6% | 7/1 | 15 | 1440-1550[2] | 93% | 9% | 16 | 42% |
| 14. Brown University (RI) | 88 | 4.5 | 4 | 97% | 94% | 95% | +1 | 92% | 169 | 16 | 70% | 11% | 6/1 | 8 | 1440-1560[2] | 95% | 8% | 22 | 27% |
| 14. Vanderbilt University (TN) | 88 | 4.3 | 17 | 97% | 96% | 93% | -3 | 90% | 288 | 17 | 57% | 13% | 8/1 | 8 | 33-35[2] | 90% | 12% | 12 | 28% |
| 14. Washington University in St. Louis | 88 | 4.2 | 11 | 96% | 98% | 94% | -4 | 92% | 375 | 12 | 67% | 8% | 7/1 | 15 | 33-35[2] | 86% | 16% | 5 | 22% |
| 17. Cornell University (NY) | 87 | 4.6 | 11 | 97% | 94% | 95% | +1 | 94% | 242 | 25 | 63% | 14% | 9/1 | 20 | 1400-1540[2] | 84% | 11% | 18 | 21% |
| 17. Rice University (TX) | 87 | 4.1 | 17 | 97% | 94% | 94% | None | 90% | 265 | 14 | 69% | 7% | 6/1 | 8 | 1460-1570[2] | 92% | 11% | 22 | 30% |
| 19. University of Notre Dame (IN) | 85 | 4.2 | 1 | 98% | 97% | 97% | None | 94% | 335 | 18 | 59% | 11% | 8/1 | 18 | 32-35[2] | 90% | 19% | 25 | 38% |
| 20. University of California–Los Angeles* | 84 | 4.4 | 25 | 97% | 88% | 91% | +3 | 88% | 21 | 34 | 48% | 23% | 18/1 | 20 | 1290-1520[2] | 97%[4] | 14% | 18 | 6% |
| 21. Emory University (GA) | 83 | 4.2 | 33 | 94% | 92% | 90% | -2 | 87% | 153 | 22 | 57% | 13% | 9/1 | 24 | 1380-1530[2] | 83% | 19% | 18 | 17% |
| 22. University of California–Berkeley* | 82 | 4.7 | 22 | 97% | 91% | 92% | +1 | 89% | 82 | 62 | 55% | 21% | 19/1 | 24 | 1290-1530[2] | 96% | 18% | 49 | 8% |
| 23. Georgetown University (DC) | 81 | 4.2 | 11 | 96% | 96% | 94% | -2 | 93% | 297 | 28 | 60% | 6% | 11/1 | 24 | 1380-1550 | 83% | 17% | 32 | 25% |
| 23. University of Michigan–Ann Arbor* | 81 | 4.5 | 22 | 97% | 89% | 93% | +4 | 89% | 297 | 37 | 57% | 17% | 14/1 | 31 | 1340-1560[2] | 77% | 26% | 41 | 15% |
| 25. Carnegie Mellon University (PA) | 80 | 4.3 | 28 | 97% | 93% | 93% | None | 90% | 288 | 20 | 67% | 12% | 6/1 | 18 | 1460-1560[2] | 89% | 17% | 39 | 15% |
| 25. University of Virginia* | 80 | 4.3 | 11 | 97% | 95% | 94% | -1 | 90% | 297 | 37 | 52% | 14% | 14/1 | 24 | 1320-1510[2] | 90% | 23% | 41 | 17% |
| 27. University of Southern California | 79 | 3.9 | 25 | 95% | 92% | 92% | None | 91% | 169 | 48 | 63% | 12% | 9/1 | 78 | 1340-1530[2] | N/A | 16% | 22 | 35% |
| 28. New York University | 78 | 4.0 | 48 | 93% | 82% | 88% | +6 | 86% | 132 | 23 | 63% | 9% | 8/1 | 28 | 1370-1540[2] | 82% | 21% | 29 | 9% |
| 28. Tufts University (MA) | 78 | 3.8 | 17 | 95% | 96% | 94% | -2 | 93% | 275 | 37 | 66% | 7% | 9/1 | 20 | 1380-1530[2] | 84% | 16% | 32 | 20% |
| 28. University of California–Santa Barbara* | 78 | 3.7 | 61 | 93% | 83% | 89% | +6 | 86% | 16 | 21 | 54% | 20% | 17/1 | 29 | 1230-1480[2] | 100% | 37% | 58 | 17% |
| 28. University of Florida* | 78 | 3.8 | 33 | 97% | 84% | 89% | +5 | 86% | 55 | 48 | 53% | 9% | 17/1 | 36 | 1290-1460 | 82% | 31% | 44 | 18% |
| 28. U. of North Carolina–Chapel Hill* | 78 | 4.2 | 28 | 96% | 90% | 91% | +1 | 89% | 127 | 87 | 46% | 12% | 15/1 | 41 | 27-33 | 74% | 24% | 32 | 15% |
| 28. Wake Forest University (NC) | 78 | 3.7 | 36 | 94% | 95% | 89% | -6 | 82% | 357 | 23 | 50% | 1% | 11/1 | 37 | 1290-1470[2] | 73% | 32% | 9 | 21% |
| 34. University of California–San Diego* | 77 | 3.9 | 43 | 94% | 86% | 87% | +1 | 84% | 26 | 48 | 46% | 24% | 19/1 | 29 | 1260-1480[2] | 100% | 38% | 25 | 3% |
| 34. University of Rochester (NY) | 77 | 3.5 | 43 | 95% | 89% | 86% | -3 | 84% | 179 | 18 | 79% | 8% | 9/1 | 37 | 1310-1500[2] | 71% | 35% | 21 | 20% |
| 36. Boston College | 76 | 3.8 | 25 | 95% | 94% | 92% | -2 | 91% | 275 | 28 | 65% | 1% | 11/1 | 31 | 1330-1500[2] | 79% | 26% | 59 | 21% |
| 36. University of California–Irvine* | 76 | 3.8 | 54 | 94% | 80% | 85% | +5 | 83% | 2 | 62 | 51% | 23% | 18/1 | 34 | 1215-1450[2] | 99% | 30% | 64 | 7%[4] |
| 38. Georgia Institute of Technology* | 74 | 4.3 | 36 | 97% | 91% | 90% | -1 | 86% | 327 | 176 | 33% | 28% | 18/1 | 20 | 1370-1530 | 88% | 21% | 59 | 15% |
| 38. University of California–Davis* | 74 | 3.9 | 48 | 93% | 84% | 86% | +2 | 83% | 16 | 189 | 32% | 31% | 20/1 | 48 | 1140-1400[2] | 100% | 46% | 32 | 6% |
| 38. University of Texas at Austin* | 74 | 4.1 | 48 | 96% | 83% | 88% | +5 | 81% | 143 | 59 | 48% | 14% | 18/1 | 41 | 1210-1470[2] | 87% | 32% | 70 | 9% |
| 38. William & Mary (VA)* | 74 | 3.9 | 28 | 95% | 94% | 91% | -3 | 88% | 351 | 56 | 49% | 8% | 12/1 | 34 | 1300-1490[2] | 77% | 42% | 109 | 23% |
| 42. Boston University | 73 | 3.8 | 39 | 93% | 86% | 89% | +3 | 89% | 232 | 34 | 56% | 15% | 10/1 | 41 | 1310-1500[2] | 66% | 20% | 49 | 9% |
| 42. Brandeis University (MA) | 73 | 3.7 | 39 | 92% | 89% | 89% | None | 90% | 143 | 56 | 55% | 10% | 10/1 | 46 | 1320-1510[2] | 59% | 34% | 52 | 17% |
| 42. Case Western Reserve Univ. (OH) | 73 | 3.7 | 61 | 93% | 90% | 85% | -5 | 83% | 202 | 32 | 63% | 13% | 11/1 | 31 | 1340-1520[2] | 70% | 30% | 39 | 16% |
| 42. Tulane University (LA) | 73 | 3.6 | 54 | 93% | 88% | 86% | -2 | 78% | 380 | 25 | 57% | 8% | 8/1 | 37 | 30-33[2] | 63% | 11% | 25 | 16% |
| 42. Univ. of Wisconsin–Madison* | 73 | 4.1 | 39 | 95% | 84% | 89% | +5 | 83% | 343 | 107 | 47% | 24% | 17/1 | 59 | 27-32[2] | 51% | 57% | 52 | 14% |
| 47. University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign* | 72 | 4.0 | 54 | 93% | 81% | 86% | +5 | 80% | 169 | 97 | 38%[4] | 21%[4] | 20/1 | 63 | 1210-1470 | 52% | 63% | 64 | 6% |
| 48. University of Georgia* | 71 | 3.7 | 43 | 95% | 81% | 87% | +6 | 81% | 202 | 72 | 46% | 11% | 17/1 | 56 | 1220-1400 | 56% | 48% | 116 | 13% |
| 49. Lehigh University (PA) | 70 | 3.3 | 39 | 94% | 86% | 88% | +2 | 88% | 275 | 34 | 47% | 8% | 9/1 | 49 | 1260-1433[2] | 66% | 50% | 52 | 13% |
| 49. Northeastern University (MA) | 70 | 3.5 | 33 | 97% | 88% | 90% | +2 | 90% | 297 | 45 | 62% | 6% | 14/1 | 41 | 1410-1540[2] | 76%[5] | 20% | 70 | 12% |
| 49. Ohio State University–Columbus* | 70 | 3.9 | 48 | 94% | 84% | 87% | +3 | 80% | 256 | 189 | 30% | 24% | 19/1 | 59 | 26-32[2] | 55% | 68% | 81 | 14% |
| 49. Pepperdine University (CA) | 70 | 3.5 | 61 | 89% | 81% | 89% | +8 | 89% | 169 | 48 | 65% | 3% | 13/1 | 81 | 1200-1410[2] | 49%[5] | 42% | 52 | 8% |
| 49. Purdue University–West Lafayette (IN)* | 70 | 3.8 | 75 | 93% | 78% | 83% | +5 | 77% | 275 | 83 | 44% | 19% | 13/1 | 70 | 1190-1430 | 48% | 67% | 103 | 16% |
| 49. Villanova University (PA) | 70 | 3.4 | 28 | 96% | 87% | 92% | +5 | 87% | 312 | 97 | 43% | 3% | 11/1 | 37 | 1320-1460[2] | 72% | 31% | 81 | 24% |

Note: Key to footnotes, Page 52.

## What Is a National University?

TO ASSESS MORE than 1,800 of the country's four-year colleges and universities, U.S. News first assigns each to a group of its peers, based on the categories of higher education institutions developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The National Universities category consists of 392 institutions (209 public, 179 private and 4 for-profit) that offer a wide range of undergraduate majors as well as master's and doctoral degrees or professional practice doctorates; some institutions emphasize research. A list of the top 30 public national universities appears on Page 63.

Data on 17 indicators of academic quality are gathered from each institution. Schools are ranked by total weighted score; those tied are listed alphabetically. For a description of the methodology, see Page 50. For more on a college, turn to the directory at the back of the book.